Maximum likelihood estimation and expectation-maximization algorithm for controlled branching processes

M. González, C. Minuesa*, I. del Puerto

Department of Mathematics, University of Extremadura, 06006 - Badajoz, Spain.

arXiv:1407.5341v3 [math.ST] 5 Feb 2015

Abstract

The controlled branching process is a generalization of the classical Bienaymé-Galton-Watson branching process. It is a useful model for describing the evolution of populations in which the population size at each generation needs to be controlled. The maximum likelihood estimation of the parameters of interest for this process is addressed under various sample schemes. Firstly, assuming that the entire family tree can be observed, the corresponding estimators are obtained and their asymptotic properties investigated. Secondly, since in practice it is not usual to observe such a sample, the maximum likelihood estimation is initially considered using the sample given by the total number of individuals and progenitors of each generation, and then using the sample given by only the generation sizes. Expectation-maximization algorithms are developed to address these problems as incomplete data estimation problems. The accuracy of the procedures is illustrated by means of a simulated example.

Keywords: Maximum likelihood estimation, expectation-maximization algorithm, branching process, controlled process.

1. Introduction

Controlled branching processes are a class of discrete-time stochastic growth population models characterized by the existence of a random control mechanism to determine in each generation (non-overlapping generations) how many progenitors participate in the subsequent reproduction process. Once the number of progenitors is known, each one reproduces independently of the others according to the same probability law, called the offspring distribution, as usual in the framework of branching processes.

In general, the notion of branching has had relevance in the development of theoretical approaches to problems in such applied fields as the growth and extinction

*Corresponding Author: Phone: +34 924289300 ext. 86820. Fax: +34 924272911.
E-mail address: cminuesaa@unex.es

of populations, biology (gene amplification, clonal resistance theory of cancer cells, polymerase chain reactions, etc.), epidemiology (the evolution of infectious diseases), cell proliferation kinetics (stem cells, etc.), genetics (sex-linked genes, mitochondrial DNA, etc.) and algorithm and data structures (see, for example, the monographs Kimmel and Axelrod (2002) and Haccou et al. (2005)). In particular, the novelty of adding to the branching notion a mechanism that fixes the number of progenitors in each generation can allow a great variety of random migratory movements to be modeled. The control mechanism can be defined either by a degenerate distribution giving rise to deterministic control or in a random way (through control probability distributions), in both cases with dependence on the number of individuals in each generation. For example, a practical situation that can be modeled by this kind of process is the evolution of an animal population that is threatened by the existence of predators. In each generation, the survival of each animal (and therefore the possibility of giving new births) will be strongly affected by this factor, making the introduction of a random mechanism (a binomial control process would be reasonable) necessary to model the evolution of this kind of population. One can also model phenomena concerning the introduction or re-introduction of animal species to inhabit environments in which they are in potential danger of disappearance or have previously become extinct. This re-population can be achieved by the controlled introduction of new animals until the species has become firmly established in that habitat.

The family of controlled branching processes includes as particular cases various models previously introduced in the branching process literature, such as branching processes with immigration (see Sriram (1994)), with immigration at state zero (see Bruss and Slavtchova-Bojkova (1999)), with random migration (see Yanev and Yanev (1996)), with bounded emigration (see del Puerto and Yanev (2008)), with adaptive control (see Bercu (1999)), and with continuous state space (see Rahimov and Al-Sabah (2007)).

The probability theory of this model has been extensively studied from the pioneering work of Yanev (1976) until the recent paper of González and del Puerto (2012) (see also the references therein). In the last few years, interest in these processes has mainly focused on the development of their inference theory in order to guarantee the applicability of these models. Results in this line from a frequentist standpoint may be found in González et al. (2004, 2005a) for deterministic control models, using maximum likelihood estimation, and in Dion and Essebbar (1995) and Sriram et al. (2007) for models with random control distributions, using martingale theory (for a multiplicative control function) and weighted conditional least squares estimation, respectively.

The objective of this paper is to consider the maximum likelihood estimation of the parameters of interest for a controlled branching process with random control distributions under various sample schemes. Firstly, we consider the entire family tree until some fixed generation can be observed. The results obtained under the observation of this sample generalize those in González et al. (2004, 2005a). Secondly,

since, in practice, it is not usual to observe the entire family tree, we consider the maximum likelihood estimation using initially the sample given by the total number of individuals and progenitors of each generation, and then the sample given by only the generation sizes. We deal with these problems as incomplete data estimation problems, and develop expectation-maximization (EM) algorithms to this end (see McLachlan and Krishnan (2008), for details of this methodological approach or for recent applications of this methodology in Bernhardt et al. (2015) and Wang et al. (2015)). EM algorithms have been successfully used to approximate maximum likelihood estimators when there are missing or incomplete data, although there are only a few articles on their use in the context of branching processes (see Veen and Schoenberg (2008), González et al. (2012), Daskalova (2014) and Hautphenne and Fackrell (2014)), and in no case for models which consider random control mechanisms.

After this Introduction, the paper is organized as follows. We begin by describing the probability model in Section 2, in which we introduce some notation and the working assumptions for the subsequent study. Section 3 is devoted to the maximum likelihood estimation based on the complete family tree and to studying the asymptotic properties of the estimators obtained. In Section 4, we address the problem of obtaining maximum likelihood estimates under incomplete sampling schemes, developing the EM algorithms. The accuracy of these algorithms is illustrated by means of a simulated example in Section 5 (see the supplementary material for data sets and a further discussion of some aspects of the example). Some concluding remarks are provided in Section 6. Finally, in order to allow a more readily comprehensible reading, Appendices A, B, and C are devoted to giving the proofs of the theoretical results set out in the paper.

2. The Probability Model

We shall focus our attention on the class of the controlled branching process with random control function (CBP). Mathematically, this process is a discrete-time stochastic growth population model $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ defined recursively as follows:

$$Z_0 = N, \quad Z_{n+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{\phi_n(Z_n)} X_{nj}, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, \tag{1}$$

where N is a non-negative integer, $\{X_{nj} : \ n = 0, 1, \ldots; j = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $\{\phi_n(k) : n, k = 0, 1, \ldots\}$ are two independent families of non-negative integer valued random variables. Also, X_{nj}, $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables, and, for each $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, $\{\phi_n(k)\}_{k\geq 0}$, are independent stochastic processes with equal one-dimensional probability distributions. The empty sum in (1) is considered to be 0. Let $p = \{p_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ denote the common probability distribution of the random variables X_{nj}, i.e., $p_k = P[X_{nj} = k]$, $k \geq 0$, and m and σ^2 its mean and variance (assumed finite), respectively. We also denote

by $\varepsilon(k) = E[\phi_0(k)]$ and $\sigma^2(k) = Var[\phi_0(k)]$ the mean and the variance of the control variables (assumed finite too).

Intuitively, Z_n denotes the number of individuals (particles) in the n-th generation and X_{nj} the number of offspring of the j-th individual in the n-th generation. The probability law p is called the offspring distribution, and m and σ^2 are the offspring mean and variance, respectively. The variable $\phi_n(Z_n)$ represents a control on the number of progenitors in each generation, in such a way that when $\phi_n(Z_n) = k$ then k will be the number of individuals who will take part in the reproduction process that will determine Z_{n+1}. Thus, if $\phi(Z_n) < Z_n$ then $Z_n - \phi_n(Z_n)$ individuals are removed from the population (emigration, presence of predators, etc.), and therefore do not participate in the future evolution of the process. If $\phi_n(Z_n) > Z_n$ then $\phi_n(Z_n) - Z_n$ new individuals of the same type are added to the population (immigration, re-population, etc.). No control is applied to the population when $\phi_n(Z_n) = Z_n$. Obviously, if $\phi_n(k) = k$ for all k, one obtains the standard Bienaymé-Galton-Watson process.

It is easy to verify that $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a Markov chain with stationary transition probabilities. Moreover, assuming

(a) $p_0 > 0$ or $P[\phi_n(k) = 0] > 0$, $k > 0$,
(b) $\phi_n(0) = 0$ almost surely $(a.s.)$,

then 0 is an absorbing state and the states $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ are transient. Whence it is verified that $P[Z_n \to 0] + P[Z_n \to \infty] = 1$.

Let us fix the main parameters of interest and the working assumptions for the development of their maximum likelihood estimation. Consider a CBP with an offspring distribution p, whose mean and variance are m and σ^2, respectively. Given that one has different control laws for different population sizes, the problem of estimating the control parameters would seem intractable based on samples with a finite dimension unless the control process is assumed to have a structure that is stable over time. In this sense, formally we consider CBPs given by (1) with control distributions belonging to the power series family of distributions, i.e., for each $k \geq 0$,

$$P[\phi_n(k) = j] = a_k(j)\theta^j A_k(\theta)^{-1}, \quad j \geq 0; \theta \in \Theta_k, \tag{2}$$

with $a_k(j)$ taking known non-negative values, $A_k(\theta) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_k(j)\theta^j$, and $\Theta_k = \{\theta > 0 : 0 < A_k(\theta) < \infty\}$ being an open subset of $\mathbb{R}$. We also assume that the sets Θ_k are independent of k, so that we shall henceforth drop the index k from Θ_k, the control parameter space. Moreover, we assume the following regularity condition:

$$\prod_{k\in C} A_k(\theta) = A_{\sum_{k\in C} k}(\theta), \quad \text{for every } C \subseteq \mathbb{N}; \theta \in \Theta. \tag{3}$$

Remark 2.1. *The distribution given in* (2) *is an exponential family which includes many important discrete distributions (e.g., Poisson, binomial, negative binomial,*

etc.). The condition (3) *is a technical hypothesis, satisfied by a wide set of probability distributions belonging to the exponential family. Hence, the control distributions in the model depend on a single parameter* θ*, termed the control parameter, and on the size of the population, say* k*.*

It is well known that:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(k) &= \varepsilon(k,\theta) = E[\phi_0(k)] = \theta \frac{d}{d\theta} \log A_k(\theta), \\ \sigma^2(k) &= \sigma^2(k,\theta) = Var[\phi_0(k)] = \theta \frac{d}{d\theta} \varepsilon(k,\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Under condition (3), it can be deduced that $\varepsilon(k,\theta) = k\mu(\theta)$, $k \geq 0$, $\theta \in \Theta$, where $\mu(\cdot)$ is a continuous and invertible function. From (3), $A_k(\theta) = A_1(\theta)^k$, $k \geq 1$, so that

$$\varepsilon(k,\theta) = \frac{\theta \frac{d}{d\theta} A_k(\theta)}{A_1(\theta)^k} = k \frac{\theta \frac{d}{d\theta} A_1(\theta)}{A_1(\theta)} = k\theta \frac{d}{d\theta} \log(A_1(\theta)) = k\varepsilon(1,\theta).$$

Therefore, a family of distributions which verifies (3) can be re-parametrized making use of the parameter $\mu = \mu(\theta) = \varepsilon(1,\theta)$. This parameter can be termed the migration parameter because of its intuitive interpretation: if $\mu < 1$, the control law allows one to model processes with expected emigration; if $\mu > 1$, one can model processes with expected immigration; and if $\mu = 1$, no migration is expected. One also notes that, under assumption (3), $\sigma^2(k,\theta) = k\theta\mu'(\theta)$, with $\mu'(\cdot)$ denoting the first derivative of $\mu(\cdot)$.

Remark 2.2. *Three interesting particular cases of distributions which verify* (2) *and* (3) *are the following:*

(i) For each $k \geq 0$*, take* $\phi_n(k)$ *to follow a Poisson distribution of parameter* $k\theta$*. Consequently,* $\mu(\theta) = \theta$*. Hence, depending on the value of* θ*, a CBP with this control function can model different migratory processes. It is easy to verify that conditions* (2) *and* (3) *hold by setting* $a_k(j) = k^j/j!$ *and* $A_k(\theta) = e^{k\theta}$*.*

(ii) For each $k \geq 0$*, take* $\phi_n(k)$ *to follow a binomial distribution of parameters* k *and* q*. Taking* $\theta = q(1-q)^{-1}$*,* $a_k(j) = \begin{pmatrix} k \\ j \end{pmatrix}$*, and* $A_k(\theta) = (1+\theta)^k$*, conditions* (2) *and* (3) *can be checked straightforwardly, and* $\mu(\theta) = \theta(1+\theta)^{-1} = q$*. From a practical viewpoint, this could be a reasonable control mechanism with which to model situations in which, in each generation, each individual can give birth to offspring in the next generation with probability* q*, and is removed from the population with probability* $1-q$*, not participating in its subsequent evolution. As* $\mu(\theta) < 1$*, a CBP with this control distribution always models a case of expected emigration, and, for example, could be useful to model the presence of predators in an animal population.*

(iii) For each $k \geq 0$, take $\phi_n(k)$ to follow a negative binomial distribution of parameters k and q. In this case, conditions (2) and (3) can be checked by setting $\theta = 1 - q$, $a_k(j) = \binom{j+k-1}{j}$, and $A_k(\theta) = (1-\theta)^{-k}$. Moreover, $\mu(\theta) = \theta(1-\theta)^{-1}$. As also was the case for the model considered in (i), this process can model either expected immigration or expected emigration.

Finally, another parameter of great interest for this family of processes is what is termed the asymptotic mean growth rate. This is denoted by τ_m, and is defined in general as $\lim_{k\to\infty} k^{-1}E[Z_{n+1}|Z_n = k] = \lim_{k\to\infty} k^{-1}m\varepsilon(k)$ (whenever it exists). Under condition (3), $\tau_m = m\mu(\theta)$. This is the threshold parameter that determines the behaviour of a CBP in relation to its extinction. Following the classification of CBPs set out in González et al. (2005b), we shall term a CBP as subcritical, critical, or supercritical depending on whether τ_m is less than, equal to, or greater than unity (emulating the Bienaymé–Galton–Watson process classification).

In summary, we deal with the problem of estimating p, m, σ^2, θ, $\mu(\theta)$, and τ_m by making use of the maximum likelihood estimation based on different samples.

3. Maximum Likelihood Estimators with Complete Data

In this section, we shall consider the maximum likelihood estimation of the aforementioned parameters of interest by assuming that one can observe the entire family tree up to generation n (complete data), i.e., the random variables $\{X_{li} : 1 \leq i \leq \phi_l(Z_l);\ 0 \leq l \leq n-1\}$, or at least $\mathcal{Z}_n^* = \{Z_l(k) : 0 \leq l \leq n-1; k \geq 0\}$, where $Z_l(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{\phi_l(Z_l)} I_{\{X_{li}=k\}}$, $0 \leq l \leq n-1$, $k \geq 0$, with I_A standing for the indicator function of the set A. Intuitively, $Z_l(k)$ represents the number of individuals in generation l who have exactly k offspring. It is easily deduced that $\phi_l(Z_l) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Z_l(k)$ and $Z_{l+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} kZ_l(k)$, $l = 0, \ldots, n-1$.

Let $Y_l = \sum_{j=0}^{l} Z_j$, $\Delta_l = \sum_{j=0}^{l} \phi_j(Z_j)$, and $Y_l(k) = \sum_{j=0}^{l} Z_j(k)$, $l \geq 0$, $k \geq 0$. Intuitively, Y_l and Δ_l denote the total number of individuals and the total number of parents until the l-th generation, respectively, and $Y_l(k)$ represents the accumulated number up to generation l of individuals who have exactly k offspring. The results presented in this section generalize those given in González et al. (2004, 2005a) for CBPs with a deterministic control function.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ be a CBP verifying (2) and (3). The maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) of p_k, $k \geq 0$, and θ, based on $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$, are, respectively:*

$$\widehat{p}_{k,n} = \frac{Y_{n-1}(k)}{\Delta_{n-1}},\ k \geq 0, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widehat{\theta}_n = \mu^{-1}\left(\frac{\Delta_{n-1}}{Y_{n-1}}\right),$$

where $\mu^{-1}(\cdot)$ denotes the inverse of the function $\mu(\cdot)$.

The proof is given in Appendix A.

Using this theorem and the invariance of the MLEs under re-parametrization, the following result is immediate:

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ be a CBP verifying* (2) *and* (3). *The MLEs of m, σ^2, $\mu(\theta)$, and τ_m based on $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$, are, respectively:*

$$\widehat{m}_n = \frac{Y_n - Z_0}{\Delta_{n-1}}, \quad \widehat{\sigma}_n^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k-\widehat{m}_n)^2\widehat{p}_{k,n}, \quad \widehat{\mu}_n = \frac{\Delta_{n-1}}{Y_{n-1}}, \text{ and } \quad \widehat{\tau}_{m,n} = \frac{Y_n - Z_0}{Y_{n-1}}.$$

For simplicity, when the meaning is clear, we shall drop the index n from $\widehat{p}_{k,n}$ and $\widehat{\tau}_{m,n}$ and write simply $\widehat{p}_k$ and $\widehat{\tau}_m$.

Remark 3.3. *(i) It is worth noting that to obtain the MLE of the offspring distribution, p, and its associated parameters, m and σ^2, it is not necessary to impose the requirement of any knowledge about the control distribution. One can thus address this problem in a nonparametric framework, obtaining the same estimators for these three parameters.*

(ii) The MLEs of p_k and m are intuitively very reasonable because we estimate the probability that an individual gives rise to k offspring by the relative proportion of parents with k offspring, and the offspring mean is estimated by the total number of offspring up to a certain generation divided by the number of progenitors who have generated those offspring.

(iii) It can be proved that $\widehat{m}_n$, $\widehat{\theta}_n$, $\widehat{\mu}_n$, and $\widehat{\tau}_m$ are also the MLEs of m, θ, $\mu(\theta)$, and τ_m, respectively, based on the sample $\{Z_0, ..., Z_n, \phi_0(Z_0), ..., \phi_{n-1}(Z_{n-1})\}$ (see Jagers (1975), Lemma 2.13.2). Moreover, $\widehat{\tau}_m$ is also the MLE of τ_m based on $\{Z_0, \ldots, Z_n\}$, following similar arguments.

3.1. Asymptotic behaviour

In order to investigate the asymptotic properties of the proposed estimators, it will be necessary to make some working assumptions. To parameters associated with the offspring distribution, one does not need to assume that the control variables belong to a power series family of distributions. Instead, one only needs to assume that the CBP $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ verifies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(a)\ \text{There exists } \tau = \lim_{k\to\infty}\varepsilon(k)k^{-1} < \infty, \text{ and the sequence } \{\sigma^2(k)k^{-1}\}_{k\geq 1} \\
&\qquad \text{is bounded.} \\
&(b)\ \tau_m = \tau m > 1, \text{ and } Z_0 \text{ large enough such that } P[Z_n \to \infty] > 0. \\
&(c)\ \{Z_n\tau_m^{-n}\}_{n\geq 0} \text{ converges } a.s. \text{ to a finite random variable } W \text{ such that} \\
&\qquad P[W > 0] > 0. \\
&(d)\ \{W > 0\} = \{Z_n \to \infty\}\ a.s.
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Remark 3.4. *(i) In González et al. (2002), conditions are provided that guarantee (b) in* (4)*. Also, in González et al. (2006), conditions are established under which* $\{W > 0\} = \{Z_n \to \infty\}$ *a.s. is verified.*

(ii) It can be proved (see González et al. (2002), Theorem 4) that, under condition (4)*, on the set* $\{Z_n \to \infty\}$ *one has that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Z_n^{-1} Z_{n+1} = \tau_m \quad a.s.$$

We shall now establish a preliminary result that will be used in the study of the estimators' asymptotic properties. The proof is omitted because it is a consequence of Remark 3.4(ii) and the Stolz-Cesàro Lemma.

Proposition 3.5. *Let* $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ *be a CBP verifying the conditions given in* (4)*. Then, on the set* $\{Z_n \to \infty\}$*, it is verified that:*

(i) $\lim_{n\to\infty} Z_n^{-1}\phi_n(Z_n) = \tau$ *a.s.*
(ii) $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi_n(Z_n)^{-1} < \infty$ *a.s.*
(iii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} Y_n^{-1} Y_{n+1} = \tau_m$ *a.s.*
(iv) $\lim_{n\to\infty} Y_n^{-1}\Delta_n = \tau$ *a.s.*
(v) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \Delta_n^{-1}\phi_n(Z_n) = \tau_m^{-1}(\tau_m - 1)$ *a.s.*
(vi) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon(Z_n)^{-1}\phi_n(Z_n) = 1$ *a.s.*

In the following result, we study asymptotic properties of the estimators related to the offspring distribution, i.e., $\widehat{p}_k$, $k \geq 0$, $\widehat{m}_n$, and $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2$. For simplicity, we shall use the notation $\mathcal{D} = \{Z_n \to \infty\}$ and $P_{\mathcal{D}}[\cdot] = P[\cdot \mid \mathcal{D}]$. The result holds whether or not conditions (2) and (3) on the control are satisfied.

Theorem 3.6. *Let* $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ *be a CBP verifying* (4)*. Then it holds that:*

(i) $\widehat{p}_k$*,* $\widehat{m}_n$*, and* $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2$ *are strongly consistent for* p_k*,* m*, and* σ^2*, respectively, on* $\{Z_n \to \infty\}$*.*

(ii) If P' *is a probability measure dominated by* $P_{\mathcal{D}}$*, then for any* $x \in \mathbb{R}$*:*

(a) $\lim_{n\to\infty} P'[(p_k(1-p_k))^{-1/2}\Delta_{n-1}^{1/2}(\widehat{p}_k - p_k) \leq x] = \Phi(x)$,

(b) $\lim_{n\to\infty} P'[\sigma^{-1}\Delta_{n-1}^{1/2}(\widehat{m}_n - m) \leq x] = \Phi(x)$,

(c) If $E[X_{01}^4] < \infty$*, then* $\lim_{n\to\infty} P'[Var[(X_{01}-m)^2]^{-1/2}\Delta_{n-1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\sigma}_n^2 - \sigma^2) \leq x] = \Phi(x)$,

with $\Phi(\cdot)$ *denoting the standard normal distribution function.*

The proof is given in Appendix B.

Remark 3.7. *Using the previous theorem and Lemma 2.3 in Guttorp (1991), it is immediate to prove that* (ii) *also holds for* $P[\cdot|Z_n > 0]$. *Then, taking into account Theorem 3.6 and Slutsky's Theorem, and assuming* $Z_n > 0$, *one can obtain asymptotic confidence intervals for the parameters* p, m, *and* σ^2. *Thus, for example, the asymptotic confidence interval for* m *at the* $1-\alpha$ *level,* $0 < \alpha < 1$, *is given by*

$$\left[\widehat{m}_n - z_\alpha \left(\widehat{\sigma}_n^2 \Delta_{n-1}^{-1}\right)^{1/2}, \widehat{m}_n + z_\alpha \left(\widehat{\sigma}_n^2 \Delta_{n-1}^{-1}\right)^{1/2}\right],$$

with z_α *being such that* $1 - \Phi(z_\alpha) = \alpha/2$.

Considering now the parameters of the control law, let us recall that if the latter belongs to the power series family of distributions then (4)(a) holds trivially, and $\tau = \mu(\theta)$. Denoting *equal in distribution* by $\stackrel{d}{=}$, one has the following result:

Theorem 3.8. *Let* $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ *be a CBP verifying* (2), (3), *and* (4). *Then it holds that:*

(i) $\widehat{\theta}_n$, $\widehat{\mu}_n$ *and* $\widehat{\tau}_m$ *are strongly consistent for* θ, $\mu(\theta)$ *and* τ_m, *respectively, on* $\{Z_n \to \infty\}$.

(ii) If, for each $l \geq 0$ *and* $z \geq 0$, $\phi_l(z) \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{s=1}^{z} X_s(l,z)$, *with* $\{X_s(l,z) : 1 \leq s \leq z; z \geq 0; l \geq 0\}$ *being i.i.d. random variables with mean* $\mu(\theta)$ *and variance* $\theta\mu'(\theta)$ *then, for any* $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

(a) $\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{D}}\left[(\theta\mu'(\theta))^{-1/2} Y_{n-1}^{1/2} \left(\widehat{\mu}_n - \mu(\theta)\right) \leq x\right] = \Phi(x)$,

(b) $\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{D}}\left[(\sigma^2\mu(\theta) + m^2\theta\mu'(\theta))^{-1/2} Y_{n-1}^{1/2} \left(\widehat{\tau}_m - \tau_m\right) \leq x\right] = \Phi(x)$,

with $\Phi(\cdot)$ *denoting the standard normal distribution function.*

The proof is given in Appendix C.

Remark 3.9. *(i) It is worthy of note that the condition set out in Theorem 3.8(ii) is satisfied by the control distributions introduced in Remark 2.2.*

(ii) Theorem 3.8 (ii) also holds for $P[\cdot|Z_n > 0]$. *Again, assuming* $Z_n > 0$, *from this theorem and Slutsky's Theorem, and replacing the values* m, σ^2, θ, *and* $\mu'(\theta)$ *by* $\widehat{m}_n$, $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2$, $\widehat{\theta}_n$, *and* $\mu'(\widehat{\theta}_n)$, *respectively, one can obtain asymptotic confidence intervals for the parameters* $\mu(\theta)$ *and* τ_m *at the* $1-\alpha$ *level,* $0 < \alpha < 1$:

$$\left[\widehat{\mu}_n - z_\alpha \left(\widehat{\theta}_n \mu'(\widehat{\theta}_n) Y_{n-1}^{-1}\right)^{1/2}, \widehat{\mu}_n + z_\alpha \left(\widehat{\theta}_n \mu'(\widehat{\theta}_n) Y_{n-1}^{-1}\right)^{1/2}\right],$$

$$\left[\widehat{\tau}_m - z_\alpha \left((\widehat{\sigma}_n^2 \mu(\widehat{\theta}_n) + \widehat{m}_n^2 \widehat{\theta}_n \mu'(\widehat{\theta}_n)) Y_{n-1}^{-1}\right)^{1/2}, \widehat{\tau}_m + z_\alpha \left((\widehat{\sigma}_n^2 \mu(\widehat{\theta}_n) + \widehat{m}_n^2 \widehat{\theta}_n \mu'(\widehat{\theta}_n)) Y_{n-1}^{-1}\right)^{1/2}\right],$$

where z_α *is such that* $1 - \Phi(z_\alpha) = \alpha/2$.

(iii) Notice that $\widehat{\tau}_m$ *is also a strongly consistent estimator for* τ_m *on* $\{Z_n \to \infty\}$ *for CBPs only verifying (4).*

4. Maximum Likelihood Estimators with Incomplete Data

In the previous section, we obtained the MLE of the parameters of interest (p, m, σ^2, θ, $\mu(\theta)$, and τ_m) based on the sample $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$. However, in practice, it might be difficult to observe the entire family tree or the variables in $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$. More realistic would be to suppose that only the total number of individuals and of progenitors of each generation are known, or even only the generation sizes. Notice that, with these two samples, $\widehat{\tau}_m$ is the MLE of τ_m (see Remark 3.3(iii)). Hence, we shall focus attention on the rest of the parameters. We shall address the problem of the maximum likelihood estimation under the aforecited samples as an incomplete data estimation procedure, making use of the EM algorithm and considering $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$ as *hidden* variables. Starting with an initial probability distribution, $p^{(0)}$, and an initial value of the control parameter, $\theta^{(0)}$, we will construct a sequence $\{(p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)})\}_{i\geq 0}$ that will converge to the MLE of (p, θ). This iterative method consists of two alternating steps which are iterated until convergence: the E and the M steps. In the E step, the expectation of the complete log-likelihood is calculated using the distribution of the unobserved data. The values of the parameters which maximize this expectation are calculated in the following M step.

4.1. Maximum likelihood estimators based on the sample $\{Z_0, \ldots, Z_n, \phi_0(Z_0), \ldots, \phi_{n-1}(Z_{n-1})\}$

We shall determine the MLE of the main parameters of the model assuming that only the set of random variables $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n = \{Z_0, \ldots, Z_n, \phi_0(Z_0), \ldots, \phi_{n-1}(Z_{n-1})\}$ can be observed.

Notice that, in accordance with Remark 3.3(iii), the MLEs of m, θ, and $\mu(\theta)$ based on the sample $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ are $\widehat{m}_n$, $\widehat{\theta}_n$, and $\widehat{\mu}_n$, respectively. Hence, we shall focus on finding the MLEs of p and σ^2 based on this sample, although we present the method in a general way, considering all the parameters.

4.1.1. The E step

We shall present the E step of the EM algorithm in the $(i+1)$-st iteration. For each i, let $p^{(i)} = \{p_k^{(i)}\}_{k\geq 0}$ and $\theta^{(i)}$ be the probability distribution and the control parameter, respectively, obtained in the i-th iteration, and $\mathcal{Z}_n^*|(\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n, \{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\})$ the probability distribution of the random vector $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$ given the sample $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ and the parameters $p^{(i)}$ and $\theta^{(i)}$. For simplicity, in the following, we shall use the notation $E_i^*[\cdot] = E_{\mathcal{Z}_n^*|(\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n, \{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\})}[\cdot]$.

In the proof of Theorem 3.1 (see Appendix A), Equation (10) gives the log-likelihood function $\ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n^*, \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n) = \ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n^*)$, which depends on the unobserved variables $Z_l(k)$, $0 \leq l \leq n-1$, $k \geq 0$. The expectation of the log-likelihood with respect to the distribution $\mathcal{Z}_n^*|(\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n, \{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\})$ is:

$$E_i^*[\ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n^*, \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n)] = \Delta_{n-1} \log \theta - \log(A_{Y_{n-1}}(\theta)) + \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} E_i^*[Z_l(k)] \log p_k + E_i^*[K]. \quad (5)$$

Thus, to obtain the value of the above expectation, one has to determine the distribution of $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$ given $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ when the parameters of the models are $p^{(i)}$ and $\theta^{(i)}$. Since the individuals reproduce independently, and the control distributions are independent of the offspring distribution, one has that, for $z_0,\ z_{l+1},\ \phi_l^*,\ z_l(k) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\},\ k \geq 0,\ 0 \leq l \leq n-1$ satisfying the constraints $z_{l+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k z_l(k)$ and $\phi_l^* = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z_l(k)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
P\big[Z_l(k) = z_l(k), 0 \leq l \leq n-1, k \geq 0 \big| Z_0 = z_0, Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}, \phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^*, 0 \leq l \leq n-1\big] = \\
&= \frac{P\big[\{Z_0 = z_0\} \cap \bigcap_{l=0}^{n-1} \{Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}, \phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^*, Z_l(k) = z_l(k), k \geq 0\}\big]}{P\big[\{Z_0 = z_0\} \cap \bigcap_{l=0}^{n} \{Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}, \phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^*\}\big]} \\
&= \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} \frac{P\big[Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}, \phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^*, Z_l(k) = z_l(k), k \geq 0 | Z_l = z_l\big]}{P\big[Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}, \phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^* | Z_l = z_l\big]} \\
&= \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} \frac{P\big[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k Z_l(k) = z_{l+1}, \phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^*, Z_l(k) = z_l(k), k \geq 0 | Z_l = z_l\big]}{P\big[Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}, \phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^* | Z_l = z_l\big]} \\
&= \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} \frac{P\big[\phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^*, Z_l(k) = z_l(k), k \geq 0 | Z_l = z_l\big]}{P\big[Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}, \phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^* | Z_l = z_l\big]} \\
&= \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} \frac{P\big[\phi_l(z_l) = \phi_l^*, \sum_{i=1}^{\phi_l(z_l)} I_{\{X_{li}=k\}} = z_l(k), k \geq 0\big]}{P\big[\sum_{i=1}^{\phi_l^*} X_{li} = z_{l+1}, \phi_l(z_l) = \phi_l^*\big]} \\
&= \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} \frac{P\big[\sum_{i=1}^{\phi_l^*} I_{\{X_{li}=k\}} = z_l(k), k \geq 0\big]}{P\big[\sum_{i=1}^{\phi_l^*} X_{li} = z_{l+1}\big]} \\
&= \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{P\big[\sum_{i=1}^{\phi_l^*} X_{li} = z_{l+1}\big]} \cdot \frac{\phi_l^*!}{\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} z_l(k)!} \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k^{(i) z_l(k)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}
$$

Notice that, although the cardinality of the support of the reproduction law may be infinite, for each $0 \leq l \leq n-1$, once z_{l+1} and ϕ_l^* are known, since $z_{l+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k z_l(k)$ and $\phi_l^* = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z_l(k)$, only a finite number of coordinates of the sequence $\{z_l(k) : k \geq 0\}$ are non-null. From (6), it is clear that to obtain the distribution $\mathcal{Z}_n^* | (\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n, \{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\})$, first it is enough to know the distributions $(Z_l(k), k \geq 0) | (Z_l, \phi_l(Z_l), Z_{l+1}, \{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\})$, for each $l = 0, \ldots, n-1$. Now, given a fixed generation, say l, assuming that $Z_l = z_l$, $Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}$ and $\phi_l(z_l) = \phi_l^*$, it is needed to determine the sample space of the vector $(Z_l(k), k \geq 0)$ taking into account that its possible values $(z_l(k),\ k \geq 0)$ must verify the constrains $z_{l+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k z_l(k)$ and $\phi_l^* = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z_l(k)$. After that, their corresponding probabilities must be obtained following the equation

$$
\frac{1}{P\big[\sum_{i=1}^{\phi_l^*} X_{li} = z_{l+1}\big]} \cdot \frac{\phi_l^*!}{\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} z_l(k)!} \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k^{(i) z_l(k)}.
$$

To this end, it is enough to calculate them from a multinomial distribution of parameters ϕ_l^* and $p^{(i)}$ and normalize the obtained probabilities. From this, it is

straightforward to obtain the expected values $E_i^*[Z_l(k)]$, $k \geq 0$. Notice that this distribution does not depend on $\theta^{(i)}$ and hence it has no influence on obtaining $E_i^*[Z_l(k)]$.

4.1.2. The M step

In the M step, one calculates the values of the parameters p and θ which maximize the expectation of the complete log-likelihood, determined in the previous step. In other words, one has to find the values $p^{(i+1)} = \{p_k^{(i+1)}\}_{k\geq 0}$ and $\theta^{(i+1)}$ which maximize the expression (5), subject to the constraints $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k^{(i+1)} = 1$, $p_k^{(i+1)} \geq 0$, $k \geq 0$.

With a procedure similar to that in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (see Appendix A) to obtain the MLEs based on the entire family tree, one obtains that the values for p and θ in the $(i+1)$-st iteration are given by

$$p_k^{(i+1)} = \frac{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i^*\left[Z_l(k)\right]}{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i^*\left[Z_l(k)\right]} = \frac{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i^*\left[Z_l(k)\right]}{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i^*\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Z_l(k)\right]} = \frac{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i^*\left[Z_l(k)\right]}{\Delta_{n-1}}, \quad k \geq 0,$$

and

$$\theta^{(i+1)} = \mu^{-1}\left(\frac{\Delta_{n-1}}{Y_{n-1}}\right).$$

Intuitively, $p_k^{(i+1)}$ represents the ratio of the average number (with respect to the probability distribution determined in the E step) of parents with k offspring to the total number of progenitors. Notice that $\theta^{(i+1)}$ does not depend on the iteration i because it is only based on $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$, which is observed, so that the algorithm reaches the value $\widehat{\theta}_n$ at the first iteration and then never leaves it. Hence, as $\theta^{(i)}$ plays no role in calculating $E_i^*[Z_l(k)]$, at each iteration of the algorithm based on $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ only $p_k^{(i)}$ is updated. Nonetheless, we include $\theta^{(i)}$ in the description of the procedure in order for it to be essentially valid in both cases considered: when $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ is observed and when the sample is only $\{Z_0, \ldots, Z_n\}$ (we shall deal with the latter case in Subsection 4.2).

Indeed, in general, the values $p^{(i+1)} = \{p_k^{(i+1)}\}_{k\geq 0}$ and $\theta^{(i+1)}$ obtained in the M step are used to begin another E step and the process is repeated until the convergence criterion is satisfied, in which case the process stops, and the final values are obtained, which we shall denoted by $\widehat{p}_n^{(EM)} = \{\widehat{p}_{k,n}^{(EM)}\}_{k\geq 0}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_n^{(EM)}$, respectively. When $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ is observed, $\theta^{(i+1)}$ is not needed to begin another E step, and obviously $\widehat{\theta}_n^{(EM)} = \widehat{\theta}_n$.

It is straightforward to verify the convergence of the algorithm by checking the conditions given in McLachlan and Krishnan (2008) on the continuity and differentiability of the expectation of the complete log-likelihood function. Consequently, the sequence $\{(p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)})\}_{i\geq 0}$ converges to the MLE of (p, θ) based on the sample $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ provided that the likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(p, \theta|\ \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n)$ is unimodal.

The EM algorithm also provides the MLE of m, σ^2, and $\mu(\theta)$ based on $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ from

the estimates obtained for the parameter p:

$$\widehat{m}_n^{(EM)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k\widehat{p}_{k,n}^{(EM)}, \quad \widehat{\sigma}_n^{2(EM)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(k - \widehat{m}_n^{(EM)}\right)^2 \widehat{p}_{k,n}^{(EM)}, \quad \widehat{\mu}_n^{(EM)} = \mu(\widehat{\theta}_n^{(EM)}).$$

Obviously, $\widehat{m}_n^{(EM)} = \widehat{m}_n$ and $\widehat{\mu}_n^{(EM)} = \widehat{\mu}_n$. Indeed, for each $i \geq 0$,

$$m_n^{(i+1)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} kp_k^{(i+1)} = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i^*[Z_l(k)]}{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i^*[Z_l(k)]} = \frac{Y_n - Z_0}{\Delta_{n-1}} = \widehat{m}_n.$$

In summary, and presented in a general way, the method to estimate the parameters p and θ, and consequently m, σ^2, and $\mu(\theta)$, consists of:

Step 0 $i = 0$. Choose values $\theta^{(0)}$, $0 \leq p_k^{(0)} \leq 1$, with $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k^{(0)} = 1$.

Step 1 *E step.* Based on $p^{(i)}$ and $\theta^{(i)}$
- (a) determine $\mathcal{Z}_n^* | (\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n, \{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\})$,
- (b) calculate $E_i[\ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n^*, \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n)]$.

Step 2 *M step.* Calculate the values

$$(p^{(i+1)}, \theta^{(i+1)}) = \arg\max_{p,\theta} E_i[\ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n^*, \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n)].$$

Step 3 If $\max\{|p_k^{(i+1)} - p_k^{(i)}|, k \geq 0, |\theta^{(i+1)} - \theta^{(i)}|\}$ is less than some convergence criterion, the algorithm halts, and the final values are denoted by $\widehat{p}_n^{(EM)}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_n^{(EM)}$. Otherwise, i is incremented by one unit, and Steps 1-3 are repeated.

4.2. Maximum likelihood estimators based on the sample $\{Z_0, \ldots, Z_n\}$

Now, we shall estimate the parameters with reduced sample information, assuming that only the total number of individuals at each generation can be observed. Let us write $\mathcal{Z}_n = \{Z_0, \ldots, Z_n\}$. Although we do not know exactly what the control function is like or the values $\phi_0(Z_0), \ldots, \phi_{n-1}(Z_{n-1})$, some information on the kind of control we are dealing with is necessary, as will be seen below.

The procedure to obtain the MLE of the model parameters is almost identical to that of the previous case: making use of the EM algorithm, one constructs a sequence $\{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\}_{i \geq 0}$ which will converge to the MLE of (p, θ) based on the sample $\mathcal{Z}_n$.

In this case, to determine the expectation of the log-likelihood in the E step, which is

$$E_i[\ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n^*, \mathcal{Z}_n)] = E_i[\Delta_{n-1}] \log \theta - \log(A_{Y_{n-1}}(\theta)) + \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} E_i[Z_l(k)] \log p_k + E_i[K], \quad (7)$$

where now $E_i[\cdot] = E_{\mathcal{Z}_n^*|(\mathcal{Z}_n,\{p^{(i)},\theta^{(i)}\})}[\cdot]$, one has to know the distribution of $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$ given $\mathcal{Z}_n$ when the parameters are $p^{(i)}$ and $\theta^{(i)}$. In this case, it can be proved that

$$P\big[Z_l(k) = z_l(k), k \geq 0, l = 0, \ldots, n-1 \big| Z_0 = z_0, \ldots, Z_n = z_n\big] = \\ = \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} \frac{a_{z_l}(\phi_l^*)\theta^{\phi_l^*} A_{z_l}(\theta)^{-1}}{P\big[Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1} | Z_l = z_l\big]} \cdot \frac{\phi_l^*!}{\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} z_l(k)!} \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k^{(i) z_l(k)}, \tag{8}$$

where z_0, z_{l+1}, $z_l(k) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $k \geq 0$, $0 \leq l \leq n-1$, satisfying $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k z_l(k) = z_{l+1}$, and with $\phi_l^* = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z_l(k)$, $0 \leq l \leq n-1$. Equation (8) means that to determine the distribution $\mathcal{Z}_n^*|(\mathcal{Z}_n, \{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\})$ is enough to know the distributions $(Z_l(k), k \geq 0)|(Z_l, Z_{l+1}, \{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\})$, $0 \leq l \leq n-1$. Now, for each fixed l, to obtain $(Z_l(k), k \geq 0)|(Z_l, Z_{l+1}, \{p^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}\})$, and given $Z_l = z_l$ and $Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}$, first one must consider the possible values for ϕ_l^*, determined from the control distribution with parameters $\theta^{(i)}$ and z_l (notice that, for this purpose, the kind of control distribution of the process has to be known). Then, for each fixed value ϕ_l^*, it is needed to obtain the sample space of the vector $(Z_l(k), k \geq 0)$ taking into account that its possible values $(z_l(k), k \geq 0)$ must verify the constrains $z_{l+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k z_l(k)$ and $\phi_l^* = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z_l(k)$. Finally their corresponding probabilities are obtained as the product of probabilities from a multinomial distribution with parameters ϕ_l^* and $p^{(i)}$ by the probability that the control distribution takes the value ϕ_l^* (suitably normalized).

The values of the parameters p and θ which maximize the expectation of the complete log-likelihood (7), subject to the constraints $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k^{(i+1)} = 1$, $p_k^{(i+1)} \geq 0$, $k \geq 0$, are:

$$p_k^{(i+1)} = \frac{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i\left[Z_l(k)\right]}{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i\left[Z_l(k)\right]} = \frac{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i\left[Z_l(k)\right]}{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Z_l(k)\right]} = \frac{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} E_i\left[Z_l(k)\right]}{E_i\left[\Delta_{n-1}\right]}, \quad k \geq 0,$$

and

$$\theta^{(i+1)} = \mu^{-1}\left(\frac{E_i\left[\Delta_{n-1}\right]}{Y_{n-1}}\right).$$

We shall denote the final values after applying the algorithm to convergence by $\widetilde{p}_n^{(EM)} = \{\widetilde{p}_{k,n}^{(EM)}\}_{k\geq 0}$ and $\widetilde{\theta}_n^{(EM)}$, respectively.

Again, it can be checked that the conditions given in McLachlan and Krishnan (2008) on the continuity and differentiability of the expectation of the complete log-likelihood function are satisfied by (7). In this case, the method also provides estimators for m, σ^2, and $\mu(\theta)$ based on $\mathcal{Z}_n$:

$$\widetilde{m}_n^{(EM)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k \widetilde{p}_{k,n}^{(EM)}, \quad \widetilde{\sigma}_n^{2(EM)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(k - \widetilde{m}_n^{(EM)}\right)^2 \widetilde{p}_{k,n}^{(EM)}, \quad \widetilde{\mu}_n^{(EM)} = \mu(\widetilde{\theta}_n^{(EM)}).$$

5. Simulated Example

We shall illustrate the foregoing results with a simulated example. We consider a CBP whose offspring distribution is given by $p_0 = 0.1084$, $p_1 = 0.2709$, $p_2 = 0.3386$,

and $p_3 = 0.2822$, and the control variables $\phi_n(k)$ follow binomial distributions with parameters k and $q = 0.6$. Thus, the offspring mean and variance are $m = 1.7946$ and $\sigma^2 = 0.9443$, respectively; $\theta = 1.5$, $\mu(\theta) = 0.6$, and the mean growth rate is $\tau_m = 1.0767$.

In practice, a CBP with control functions of this kind may be useful to model the evolution of a population with the presence of predators. Recall that this binomial control mechanism models situations in which each individual can give birth to offspring in the next generation with probability q, or can be removed from the population, not participating in its subsequent evolution, with probability $1 - q$.

Notice that both θ and $\mu(\theta)$ determine the control distribution when the population size is known. Consequently, we shall focus on the migration parameter $\mu(\theta)$, which in this case is easily interpretable. According to the classification of these models (see Section 2), the process considered in this example is a supercritical CBP with an offspring mean that is also supercritical, i.e., greater than unity. Notice that 40% of the individuals do not participate in the reproduction process for the next generation (i.e., they are taken by predators).

We simulate the first 30 generations of such a process starting with $Z_0 = 1$ individual. The different samples will be denoted by z^*_{30}, $\overline{z}_{30}$, and z_{30} for that based on the entire family tree, on the individuals and progenitors, and on the population size only, respectively – see the supplementary material. Figure 1 shows the evolution of the number of individuals and progenitors. One sees that the reproduction process makes up for the control process, and, despite the emigration/predators, the process grows. Thus, this path seems to belong to the set $\{Z_n \to \infty\}$. Under the conditions of the example, in González et al. (2002) and González et al. (2006) it is proved that, on the set $\{Z_n \to \infty\}$, the process grows exponentially with rate τ_m (hence, the assumption set out in (4) holds).



Figure 1: Evolution of the number of individuals (solid line) and the number of progenitors (dashed line).

First, we determined the MLEs and their approximate 95% confidence intervals based on the entire family tree, z^*_{30}, for p, m, σ^2, $\mu(\theta)$, and τ_m. The estimates are

	PARAMETERS							
SAMPLE	p_0	p_1	p_2	p_3	m	σ^2	$\mu(\theta)$	τ_m
z^*_{30}	.1027	.2765	.3389	.2820	1.8002	.9293	.6087	1.0957
$\overline{z}_{30}$	.1211	.2528	.3308	.2953	1.8002	.9927	.6087	1.0957
z_{30}	.1299	.3083	.3283	.2335	1.6653	.9496	.6579	1.0957
TRUE VALUE	.1084	.2709	.3386	.2822	1.7946	.9443	.6000	1.0767

Table 1: Estimates of the parameters of interest based on the samples considered z^*_{30}, $\overline{z}_{30}$, and z_{30}.

given in Table 5. Figures 2–4 show their behaviours over the course of generations. In these figures we plot the estimates obtained based on the samples restricted to the first n generations, for n going from 0 to 30. One observes that they approach the true values of the parameters, in accordance with Theorems 3.6 and 3.8 and Remark 3.9(ii).

We shall now illustrate the performance of the EM algorithm in the two situations studied above: using the sample given by the total number of individuals and progenitors in each generation, and the sample given by only the generation sizes. In both cases, assuming that there is no information available about the offspring distribution, only the maximum number of offspring per progenitor, we start the algorithm with a uniform distribution on $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and $\theta^{(0)} = 1/2$. The maximum number of offspring per progenitor in an animal population is a datum that is likely to be known once the reproductive cycle of the corresponding species is understood. Even if this information is unavailable, one can try various (but reasonable) values for this maximum number of offspring per progenitor, and compare the results using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) in order to choose the optimal value (we shall illustrate this procedure below).

Using the first sample, individuals plus progenitors, we ran the algorithm until attaining a difference between two consecutive iterations smaller than 10^{-6}, with this convergence occurring from iteration 733 onwards. The resulting estimates are given in Table 5. We repeated this procedure considering samples $\overline{z}_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, 30$, to assess the consistency of the estimates. Figures 5 and 6 (right) show the evolution of these estimates obtained after convergence of the EM algorithm, and based on the samples $\overline{z}_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, 30$ (dashed lines), together with MLEs based on the entire family tree, for the parameters p_k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, and σ^2. As was mentioned above, the EM algorithm is not needed to approximate the MLEs of m, θ, and $\mu(\theta)$ based on the total number of individuals and progenitors in each generation.

We also applied the EM algorithm using the sample defined by only the population sizes, z_{30}. Recall that it is necessary in this case to know the kind of control distribution with which one is working. In practice, this information can come from knowledge of how the population has developed. For instance, if there are predators in the environment, a binomial control distribution would be clearly justified. In the simulation, we observed convergence from iteration 1164 onwards (again for a precision of 10^{-6}). The estimates of the parameters are listed in Table 5 and their



Figure 2: Evolution of the estimates given by $\widehat{p}_0$, $\widehat{p}_1$, $\widehat{p}_2$, and $\widehat{p}_3$ (solid line), and their approximate 95% confidence intervals (dashed line), together with the true value of the parameters (horizontal line).

temporal evolution is plotted in Figures 5, 6, and 7 (left). One observes in the figures that all the parameters approach their respective true values over the course of the generations.

We studied the influence of the values of $(p^{(0)}, \theta^{(0)})$ on the convergence of the algorithms using discrete sensitivity analysis. The methods were started with 300 different random initial values. The distributions $p^{(0)}$ with support $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ were randomly chosen from a Dirichlet distribution with all the parameters equal to unity (i.e., by sampling uniformly from the unit simplex), and the values of $\theta^{(0)}$ through the equation $\theta^{(0)} = q^{(0)}(1 - q^{(0)})^{-1}$, with $q^{(0)}$ sampled from a uniform distribution on the open interval $(0, 1)$. Clearly, the EM algorithm based on the sample $\overline{z}_{30}$ is insensitive to such choices. But the EM algorithm based on z_{30} was observed to not be at all robust to the choice of initial values, with convergence to different estimates that could have been local maxima or saddle points. In order to choose the best approximation to the MLE based on z_{30} (which we will call the EM estimate), we



Figure 3: Evolution of the estimates given by $\widehat{m}_n$ (left) and $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2$ (right) over the course of the generations (solid line) and their approximate 95% confidence intervals (dashed line). The horizontal line represents the true value of each parameter.



Figure 4: Evolution of the estimates given by $\widehat{\mu}_n$ (left) and $\widehat{\tau}_m$ (right) over the course of the generations (solid line) and their approximate 95% confidence intervals (dashed line). The horizontal line represents the true value of each parameter.

propose the following methodological approach.

The log-likelihood function based on the sample $\mathcal{Z}_n$, denoted by $\ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n)$, is given by the expression

$$\ell(p, \theta \mid Z_l = z_l,\ l = 0, \ldots, n) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \left(\sum_{l=0}^{z_j} P^{*l}_{z_{j+1}} \binom{z_j}{l} \frac{\theta^l}{(1+\theta)^{z_j}} \right) \tag{9}$$

with $P^{*l}_{\cdot}$ denoting the l-fold convolution of the offspring law p. While maximization of $\ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n)$ would seem to be intractable using standard methods, (17) can be evaluated for each particular (p, θ). Our proposal is, therefore, to take as EM estimates of the parameters those associated with the greatest log-likelihood when it is evaluated at the convergence points of the EM algorithm started with different randomly chosen values of the parameters. In our example, the maximum is obtained



Figure 5: Evolution of the estimates given by $\widehat{p}$ (solid line), $\widehat{p}^{(EM)}$ (dashed line), and $\widetilde{p}^{(EM)}$ (dotted line).

on the estimates given in Table 5 (see the supplementary material for a further discussion). This methodological strategy can be also followed when the sample is $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ (if necessary -not for our sample observed, $\overline{z}_{30}$), taking into account that

$$\ell(p,\theta \mid Z_l = z_l, \phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^*,\ l = 0,\ldots,n-1; Z_n = z_n) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log\left(P_{z_{j+1}}^{*\phi_l^*}\binom{z_j}{\phi_l^*}\frac{\theta^{\phi_l^*}}{(1+\theta)^{z_j}}\right).$$

Moreover, it can be extended to processes with whatever type of control function by only assuming (as has been assumed in our example) knowledge of the kind of control distribution and of the maximum number of offspring per progenitor (denoted by s_{max}). Besides, the possibility of calculating the log-likelihood functions under the samples $\mathcal{Z}_n$ and $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$ allows us to evaluate the influence of the control distribution and of the value of s_{max}, applying the above method with different control distributions and/or values of s_{max}, and using the AIC to compare the resulting models. We have made this study considering the sample $\overline{z}_{30}$. The results obtained are given in Table



Figure 6: Evolution of the estimates of m (left) and σ^2 (right) based on the entire family tree (solid line), on the total number of individuals and progenitors (dashed line) –for estimates of m, this coincides with the solid line– and on the total number of individuals (dotted line), together with the true value of each parameter (horizontal line).

s_{max}	Iterations	Control distribution					
		Binomial		N Binomial		Poisson	
		Log	AIC	Log	AIC	Log	AIC
3	733	-166.2663	341.2469	-176.1572	361.0288	-170.9058	350.5259
4	4143	-164.8032	340.6973	-174.6942	360.4792	-169.4427	349.9763
5	4244	-164.8032	343.1620	-174.6942	362.9439	-169.4427	352.4410
6	4690	-164.8032	345.7196	-174.6942	365.5015	-169.4427	354.9986

Table 2: Summary of the results for the influence of the control distributions and s_{max} values. Log denotes $\ell(\widehat{p}^{(EM)}, \widehat{\theta}^{(EM)} \mid \overline{z}_{30})$. N Binomial denotes the negative binomial distribution. The Iterations column corresponds to the number of iterations needed to attain a precision of 10^{-6} in the EM procedure for the different s_{max} values.

2, in which one observes that for any value of s_{max}, the minimum AIC corresponds to the binomial control distributions. With respect to the influence of s_{max}, the cases $s_{max} = 3$ and 4 led to values that differed little from each other. Considering therefore *parsimonious parametrization*, it would be reasonable to choose $s_{max} = 3$ as optimal. In summary, for problems in which there is no precise knowledge of s_{max} or of the kind of control, a satisfactory procedure would be one like the foregoing, based on comparing in terms of the AIC several fitted models (allowing both expected emigration and expected immigration).

Finally, to approximate the sampling distributions of $\widehat{p}_{30}^{(EM)}$, $\widetilde{p}_{30}^{(EM)}$, and $\widetilde{\theta}_{30}^{(EM)}$ and of their associated parameters, $\widehat{\sigma}_{30}^{2(EM)}$, $\widetilde{\sigma}_{30}^{2(EM)}$, $\widetilde{m}_{30}^{(EM)}$, and $\widetilde{\mu}_{30}^{(EM)}$, we applied a bootstrap procedure. We use $\widehat{p}_{30}^{(EM)}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_{30}^{(EM)}$, based on $\overline{z}_{30}$, as parameters to perform a Monte Carlo simulation of 1000 processes up to generation 30. We applied the EM algorithm for each of these bootstrapped samples, obtaining bootstrap approximations to the sampling distributions of $\widehat{p}_{30}^{(EM)}$, and consequently of $\widehat{\sigma}_{30}^{2(EM)}$.



Figure 7: Evolution of the estimates of $\mu(\theta)$ (left) based on the entire family tree (solid line) and on the total number of individuals per generation (dotted line), together with the true value of the parameter (horizontal line). Bootstrap sampling densities of $\widehat{\sigma}_{30}^{2(EM)}$ (solid line) and $\widetilde{\sigma}_{30}^{2(EM)}$ (dotted line).



Figure 8: Bootstrap sampling densities of $\widetilde{m}_{30}^{(EM)}$ (left) and $\widetilde{\mu}_{30}^{(EM)}$ (center) and joint distribution of $(\widetilde{m}_{30}^{(EM)}, \widetilde{\mu}_{30}^{(EM)})$ with the curve $m\mu(\theta) = 1.0767$ (right), together with the true values of the parameters.

Analogously, using the estimates based on the sample z_{30}, we obtained the bootstrap approximations of the sampling distributions of the corresponding estimators. To illustrate these results without excessive repetition, we shall focus on the offspring mean and variance and on the migration parameter. Figure 7 (right) shows the bootstrap sampling distributions of $\widehat{\sigma}_{30}^{2(EM)}$ and $\widetilde{\sigma}_{30}^{2(EM)}$. One observes that the distribution of $\widetilde{\sigma}_{30}^{2(EM)}$ is more variable than that of $\widehat{\sigma}_{30}^{2(EM)}$. This is a consequence of the lack of information represented by the control variables not being observed. Figure 8 shows the joint distribution of $(\widetilde{m}_{30}^{(EM)}, \widetilde{\mu}_{30}^{(EM)})$ and its marginal distributions. One observes how strongly these estimators are related, with their being distributed around the curve given by $\tau_m = m\mu(\theta) = 1.0767$.

Based on the foregoing bootstrap distributions, one can calculate the bootstrap estimates of the mean squared error (MSE) of the respective estimators based on the samples $\overline{z}_{30}$ and z_{30}, and compare the accuracy of the different estimators through

	p_0	p_1	p_2	p_3	m	σ^2	$\mu(\theta)$
MSE based on $\overline{z}_{30}$	0.0081	0.0324	0.0332	0.0085	0.0022	0.0808	0.0004
MSE based on z_{30}	0.0136	0.0613	0.0637	0.0260	0.1243	0.1438	0.0247
eff	1.6779	1.8906	1.9208	3.0594	56.5083	1.7790	62.6719

Table 3: Efficiency of the estimators based on $\overline{z}_{30}$ relative to the estimators based on z_{30} for the parameters of interest.

their relative efficiency (eff) (Table 6). One observes from the table that the estimates provided by assuming observation of $\bar{z}_{30}$ are preferable to those assuming observation of z_{30}. This can be understood as a reflection of the greater information content of the former of the two samples.

Computational complexity

With the aim of determining the order of the computational complexity of each iteration of the two EM algorithms proposed, we evaluate the number of operations needed to obtain $E_i[Z_l(k)]$ and $E_i^*[Z_l(k)]$, $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$; $k = 0, 1, \ldots, s_{max}$, respectively (recall s_{max} is the maximum number of offspring per progenitor).

Let $E^{(i)} = (E_i[Z_l(k)])_{0\leq l\leq n-1; 0\leq k\leq s_{max}}$ and $E^{*(i)} = (E_i^*[Z_l(k)])_{0\leq l\leq n-1; 0\leq k\leq s_{max}}$. Considering the sample $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$, let B_l be the matrix storing the tree associated to the transition from $\phi_l(Z_l)$ to Z_{l+1}, that is, it stores by rows the possible values of the vector $(Z_l(0), \ldots, Z_l(s_{max}))$ such that $\sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} Z_l(k) = \phi_l(Z_l)$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} kZ_l(k) = Z_{l+1}$, $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. Let us denote b_l the number of rows of B_l, $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. Finally, for $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$, let P_l be a row vector whose elements are the probabilities of each row of B_l, obtained by equation (6), that is, if $\phi_l(Z_l) = \phi_l^*$ and $Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}$, the corresponding element of P_l for the row of B_l given by $(z_l(0), \ldots, z_l(s_{max}))$ is equal to

$$\frac{1}{P[\sum_{i=1}^{\phi_l^*} x_{li} = z_{l+1}]} \frac{\phi_l^*!}{\prod_{k=0}^{s_{max}} z_l(k)!} \prod_{k=0}^{s_{max}} p_k^{(i)z_l(k)}.$$

Then, the l-th row of $E^{(i)}$ is equal to the product $P_l \cdot B_l$, $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$.

Analogously, assuming the sample $\mathcal{Z}_n$, for $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$, let B_l^* be the matrix storing the tree associated to the transition from Z_l to Z_{l+1}, that is, its rows store all the possible values of the vector $(Z_l(0), \ldots, Z_l(s_{max}))$ that allow reaching Z_{l+1} from Z_l. To obtain such a matrix, if $Z_l = z_l$ and $Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1}$, we consider for each possible value of $\phi_l(z_l)$, say ϕ_l^*, every vector $(z_l(0), \ldots, z_l(s_{max}))$ such that $\sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} z_l(k) = \phi_l^*$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} kz_l(k) = z_{l+1}$, $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. Now, for each one of these vectors we obtain the probabilities (see equation (8))

$$\frac{a_{z_l}(\phi_l^*)\theta^{\phi_l^*} A_{z_l}(\theta)^{-1}}{P[Z_{l+1} = z_{l+1} | Z_l = z_l]} \frac{\phi_l^*!}{\prod_{k=0}^{s_{max}} z_l(k)!} \prod_{k=0}^{s_{max}} p_k^{(i)z_l(k)},$$

which are ordered in the row vector P_l^*. Then, the l-th row of $E^{*(i)}$ is equal to the product $P_l^* \cdot B_l^*$, $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. Let us denote by b_l^* the number of the rows of B_l^*, $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$.

Hence, for each iteration of both methods we can determine the order of the computational complexity as $s_{max} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} b_l$ and $s_{max} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} b_l^*$, respectively. Now, for each $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$, b_l depends on the values of s_{max}, $\phi_l(Z_l)$ and Z_{l+1}, and b_l^* on s_{max}, Z_l and Z_{l+1}, but it is not possible to obtain closed forms of them. To obtain an upper bound of b_l one can obtain the dimension of the biggest transition tree. In the case of binomial control functions, this tree can be generated by considering $\phi_l(Z_l) = Z_l$ (the maximum number of progenitors). Clearly, the dimension of this tree is greater than or equal to that of the one that leads to Z_{l+1}. By an empirical study (see supplementary material for details) we have determined that $b_l = O(Z_l^{s_{max}-1})$. In a similar way, an upper bound of b_l^* is given by the dimension of the biggest tree that can be generated by Z_l individuals under the lack of awareness of the exact number of progenitors $\phi_l(Z_l)$. Again, we have determined empirically (see supplementary material for details) that, in the case of binomial control functions, $b_l^* = O(Z_l^{s_{max}})$. This fact allows us to compare, at least roughly, the computational complexity of both methods, indicating that for a generation of size z, one needs to generate trees of dimension z times greater when only the population size is observed than when the number of progenitors, $\phi_l(z)$, is also available. Figure 9 reveals this fact in our numerical example. This implies that the EM procedure requires much more time



Figure 9: Evolution of (b_l, b_l^*)-left- and $(b_l^*, z_l b_l)$-right-, $l = 0, \ldots, 29$, given the samples $\overline{z}_{30}$ and z_{30}, and by considering $s_{max} = 3$ and binomial control distributions.

in each iteration when storing only $\mathcal{Z}_n$, compared to when storing $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$. In particular, in our example, the same number of iterations of the procedure required a factor of 128 less time under the sample with observation of offspring and progenitors than under the sample based only on generation sizes. Also, the second of these two procedures needed more iterations to reach convergence. Hence, as was to be expected due to the relative loss of information, the second method is far more costly

computationally than the first (by a factor of roughly 170 for a precision of 10^{-6}, in terms of computational time). Moreover, this second procedure involves post–processing which involves running it several times for different seeds, and evaluating the exact likelihood at the convergence points.

Remark 5.1. *The example simulations were performed by parallel computing using the* **R** *statistical software environment (see R Core Team (2014)). For the estimator density and the exact log-likelihood function calculations, we used the* sm *and* polynom *packages (see Bowman and Azzalini (2014) and Venables et al. (2014)), respectively.*

6. Concluding Remarks

We have studied the maximum likelihood estimation of the main parameters of the CBP with random control function considering a nonparametric framework for the offspring distribution and a parametric scheme for the control process. First, assuming the entire family tree is observable, we determined the MLEs of the parameters associated with the offspring distribution and with the control law, and established their consistency and limiting normality. These results generalized those that had been obtained for the parameters associated with the offspring law for CBPs with deterministic control function. We also provided new results on the estimation of the control and migration parameters, with particular note made of their asymptotic properties.

Since in practice it is difficult to observe the entire family tree, we considered two more realistic situations, one assuming that the only observable data are the total number of individuals and progenitors in each generation, $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$, and the other that even only the generation sizes are observable, $\mathcal{Z}_n$. In both cases, we addressed the problem of obtaining the MLEs of the main parameters of the model by an incomplete data estimation procedure. To this end, we made use of the EM algorithm. A simulated example showed that this seems to work appropriately based on the sample $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$. Based on the sample $\mathcal{Z}_n$, we encountered the problem that the algorithm may converge to local maxima or saddle points. In such a case, we proposed running the algorithm with a large number of different starting values, and choosing the ones associated with the highest value of the log-likelihood function (this function can be evaluated although it can not be maximized by standard methods). The simulated example showed this methodological strategy to also work adequately. The procedure based on knowledge of the total numbers of individuals and progenitors converges rapidly, providing adequate accuracy with reasonably short computation times. Storing only $\mathcal{Z}_n$ however, we found the EM algorithm to require not only much more time for each iteration but also more iterations to reach convergence (with the same precision).

In the simulated example, we also illustrated the consistency of the estimates based on the three samples. (The only case established theoretically in the paper was that corresponding to observing the entire family tree.) We then used a

bootstrapping approach to get approximations to the sampling distributions of the estimators obtained by the EM algorithm, finding that the more information that the samples contained, the smaller was the variability of the estimator.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the referee for her/his careful reading of our paper and for her/his constructive comments which have improved its presentation. Also, the authors would like to thank Horacio González-Velasco and Carlos García-Orellana for providing them with computational support. Research supported by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad and the FEDER through the Plan Nacional de Investigación Científica, Desarrollo e Innovación Tecnolólgica, grant MTM2012-31235.

Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 3.1

It is immediate to verify that the likelihood function based on $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$ is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(p,\theta\,|Z_l(k)=z_l(k),0\le l\le n-1;k\ge 0)=\\ =\theta^{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1}\phi_l^*}A_{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1}z_l}(\theta)^{-1}\prod_{l=0}^{n-1}\frac{\phi_l^*!\;a_{z_l}(\phi_l^*)}{\prod_{k=0}^{\infty}z_l(k)!}\prod_{k=0}^{\infty}p_k^{z_l(k)},\end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_l^*=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}z_l(k)$. Consequently, the log-likelihood function based on $\mathcal{Z}_n^*$ is:

$$\ell(p,\theta\,|\mathcal{Z}_n^*)=f(p)+g(\theta)+K, \tag{10}$$

with $f(p)=\sum_{l=0}^{n-1}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}Z_l(k)\log p_k$, $g(\theta)=\Delta_{n-1}\log\theta-\log(A_{Y_{n-1}}(\theta))$ and K some positive random variable whose expression does not depend on p or θ.

From (10), one has to maximize $f(p)+g(\theta)$ subject to the constraints $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}p_k=1$, $p_k\ge 0$, $k\ge 0$. Using the non-negativity of the Kullback-Leibler divergence, it can be verified that the value of p which maximizes the function $f(p)\Delta_{n-1}$, and hence, $f(p)$, is

$$\widehat{p}_{k,n}=\frac{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1}Z_l(k)}{\sum_{l=0}^{n-1}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}Z_l(k)}=\frac{Y_{n-1}(k)}{\Delta_{n-1}},\qquad k\ge 0.$$

Moreover, it can easily be shown that

$$\widehat{\theta}_n=\mu^{-1}\left(\frac{\Delta_{n-1}}{Y_{n-1}}\right)$$

is an extremum of the function $g(\theta)$. Taking into account that

$$\frac{d^2g(\theta)}{d\theta^2}\Big|_{\theta=\widehat{\theta}_n}=-\frac{\Delta_{n-1}-\varepsilon(Y_{n-1},\theta)+\sigma^2(Y_{n-1},\theta)}{\theta^2}\Big|_{\theta=\widehat{\theta}_n}<0,$$

one has that $\widehat{\theta}_n$ is the maximum of $g(\theta)$ and then $(\widehat{p}_n,\widehat{\theta}_n)$ maximizes $f(p)+g(\theta)$.

Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 3.6

(i) We shall prove that $\widehat{p}_k$ is strongly consistent for p_k, making use of a strong law of large numbers for martingales. We shall fix $k \geq 0$, and prove that, as $n \to \infty$,

$$\widehat{p}_k = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi_j(Z_j)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1})} I_{\{X_{i-1j}=k\}} \to p_k \quad a.s. \text{ on } \{Z_n \to \infty\}. \tag{11}$$

For simplicity, we will consider $P[Z_n \to \infty] = 1$. For each $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, let

$$\begin{aligned} V_i(k) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1})} (I_{\{X_{i-1j}=k\}} - p_k), \\ \mathcal{H}_i &= \sigma(X_{l-1j}, \phi_{l-1}(k) : 1 \leq l \leq i, j \geq 1, k \geq 0). \end{aligned}$$

It is verified that $\{V_i(k), \mathcal{H}_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ is a martingale difference. In these terms, $\widehat{p}_k - p_k = \Delta_{n-1}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_i(k)$.

For each $n \geq 0$, let $U_n = Y_{n-1}$. Then, taking into account Proposition 3.5(iv), to prove (11) one only needs to obtain that, as $n \to \infty$,

$$U_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_i(k) \to 0 \quad a.s. \tag{12}$$

Since $U_n \to \infty$, to prove (12), using Theorem 2.18 in Hall and Heyde (1980), it is enough to verify that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i^{-2} E[|V_i(k)|^2 | \mathcal{H}_{i-1}] < \infty$ *a.s.* Now, let $M = \sup_{n\geq 0} \Delta_n Y_n^{-1} < \infty$ *a.s.* and $N = \sup_{n\geq 0} \varepsilon(Z_n)\phi_n(Z_n)^{-1} < \infty$ *a.s.* (guaranteed by Proposition 3.5(iv) and (vi), respectively). Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i^{-2} E[|V_i(k)|^2 | \mathcal{H}_{i-1}] &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{E\left[Var\left[\sum_{j=1}^{\phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1})} I_{\{X_{i-1j}=k\}} \middle| \phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1})\right]\right]}{Y_{i-1}^2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon(Z_{i-1}) p_k(1-p_k)}{Y_{i-1}^2} \\ &= p_k(1-p_k) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon(Z_{i-1})}{\phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1})} \cdot \frac{\phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1})}{\Delta_{i-1}^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta_{i-1}}{Y_{i-1}}\right)^2 \\ &\leq p_k(1-p_k) N M^2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1})} < \infty \quad a.s., \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is true due to $\phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1}) \leq \Delta_{i-1}$, $i \geq 1$, and Proposition 3.5(ii).

The strong consistency of $\widehat{m}_n$ is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.5(ii)-(v).

Taking into account that both $\widehat{m}_n$ and $\widehat{p}_k$ are strongly consistent for m and p_k,

respectively, on $\{Z_n \to \infty\}$, it is deduced that $\widehat{\sigma}_n^2$ is strongly consistent for σ^2.

(ii) The key to proving (ii) (a) and (b) is to rewrite

$$\widehat{p}_k - p_k \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{\Delta_{n-1}} \sum_{l=1}^{\Delta_{n-1}} \left(I_{\{X_l=k\}} - p_k \right), \quad \widehat{m}_n - m \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{\Delta_{n-1}} \sum_{l=1}^{\Delta_{n-1}} (X_l - m),$$

with $\stackrel{d}{=}$, as one recalls, denoting equal in distribution, and $\{X_l\}_{l\geq 1}$ being a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with common distribution being the offspring distribution. The results are derived by applying a central limit theorem for random sums as was done, *mutatis mutandis*, in the proofs of Theorems 3.2 and 4.2 in González et al. (2004) for CBPs with deterministic control function.

Finally, to prove (ii) (c), we adapt the proof established in Theorem 3.1 in González et al. (2005a) for CBPs with deterministic control function. We here provide just a brief scheme. The result is firstly proved for $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k-m)^2\widehat{p}_k$, i.e., when m is considered known. Due to the fact that one can write

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k-m)^2\widehat{p}_k \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{\Delta_{n-1}} \sum_{l=1}^{\Delta_{n-1}} (X_l - m)^2,$$

the result holds by using the central limit theorem cited above, following similar steps to those in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in González et al. (2005a). Now, notice that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k-m)^2\widehat{p}_k - \widehat{\sigma}_n^2 = (\widehat{m}_n - m)^2$, so that, by considering (ii) (b), $\sigma^2\Delta_{n-1}^{-1/2} \xrightarrow{P'} 0$, and Slutsky's Theorem, one has

$$\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k-m)^2\widehat{p}_k - \widehat{\sigma}_n^2 \right) \Delta_{n-1}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{P'} 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Hence, together with the fact that the result holds when m is known and Slutsky's Theorem, (ii) (c) follows.

Appendix C. Proof of Theorem 3.8

(i) This is immediate from Proposition 3.5(iv).

(ii) (a) For simplicity, we shall suppose $P[Z_n \to \infty] = 1$. Let $D_i = \phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1}) - \mu(\theta)Z_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(Z_0, \ldots, Z_i, \phi_0(Z_0), \ldots, \phi_{i-1}(Z_{i-1}))$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ We have

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{n-1}^{1/2}\left(\widehat{\mu} - \mu(\theta)\right) &= Y_{n-1}^{-1/2}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left((Z_{i-1}+1)^{1/2} - (\tau_m^{i-1}W)^{1/2} \right) \frac{D_i}{(Z_{i-1}+1)^{1/2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + W^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_m^{(i-1)/2} \frac{D_i}{(Z_{i-1}+1)^{1/2}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

with W being the limit variable introduced in (4)(c). Taking into account $\tau_m^{-n} Y_{n-1} \to (\tau_m - 1)^{-1} W$ *a.s.* as $n \to \infty$, it follows that it is enough to prove

$$(I) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left((Z_{i-1}+1)^{1/2} - (\tau_m^{i-1} W)^{1/2} \right) \frac{D_i}{(Z_{i-1}+1)^{1/2}} = o_P(\tau_m^{n/2}) \tag{13}$$

and

$$(II) = (\tau_m - 1)^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_m^{-(n-i+1)/2} \frac{D_i}{(Z_{i-1}+1)^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \theta\mu'(\theta)), \tag{14}$$

as $n \to \infty$, with $o_P(\cdot)$ denoting the stochastic order analogue of $o(\cdot)$ (i.e., write $X_n = o_P(Y_n)$ to mean $P(|X_n| \geq \epsilon |Y_n|) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, for each $\epsilon > 0$). The proof follows similar steps to those given in Sriram et al. (2007), Theorem 2. For each $n \geq 0$, let

$$A_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_m^{(i-1)/2} \left(\left(\frac{Z_{i-1}+1}{\tau_m^{i-1}} \right)^{1/2} - W^{1/2} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad B_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_m^{(i-1)/2} \frac{D_i^2}{Z_{i-1}+1}.$$

Then, applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $|(I)| \leq A_n^{1/2} B_n^{1/2}$. By (4)(c), one obtains $(\tau_m^{-(i-1)}(Z_{i-1}+1))^{1/2} - W^{1/2} \to 0$ *a.s.*, and consequently, using the Stolz-Cèsaro Lemma, $A_n = o_P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_m^{(i-1)/2}\right) = o_P\left(\tau_m^{n/2}\right)$. Now, using

$$E[D_i^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \theta\mu'(\theta) Z_{i-1}, \quad i \geq 1, \tag{15}$$

one has that $E[B_n] = O\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_m^{(i-1)/2}\right) = O\left(\tau_m^{n/2}\right)$, as $n \to \infty$, which implies that $|B_n| = O_P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_m^{(i-1)/2}\right) = O_P\left(\tau_m^{n/2}\right)$ as $n \to \infty$, with $O_P(\cdot)$ denoting the stochastic order analogue of $O(\cdot)$ (i.e., write $X_n = O_P(Y_n)$ to mean: for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a real number M such that $P(|X_n| \geq M|Y_n|) < \epsilon$ if n is large enough). Hence (13) follows.

To establish (14), let $\gamma_{nj} = D_{n-j+1}(Z_{n-j}+1)^{-1/2}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tau_m - 1)^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_m^{-(n-i+1)/2} \frac{D_i}{(Z_{i-1}+1)^{1/2}} &= (\tau_m - 1)^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \tau_m^{-j/2} \frac{D_{n-j+1}}{(Z_{n-j}+1)^{1/2}} \\
&= (\tau_m - 1)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{J} \tau_m^{-j/2} \gamma_{nj} + \sum_{j=J+1}^{n} \tau_m^{-j/2} \gamma_{nj} \right) \\
&= U_{Jn} + (\tau_m - 1)^{1/2} \sum_{j=J+1}^{n} \tau_m^{-j/2} \gamma_{nj} = U_{nn},
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

with $U_{Jn} = (\tau_m - 1)^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \tau_m^{-j/2} \gamma_{nj}$, $J = 1, \ldots, n$. For $J \geq 1$ and given $(t_1, \ldots, t_J) \in \mathbb{R}^J$, it can be proved, using analogous arguments to those given in the proof of Theorem 1 in Heyde and Brown (1971), jointly with the condition assumed in *(ii)*, that

$$E\left[e^{i \sum_{j=1}^{J} t_j \tau_m^{-j/2} \gamma_{nj}} \right] \to e^{-\frac{1}{2} \theta\mu'(\theta) \sum_{j=1}^{J} t_j^2 \tau_m^{-j}}, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Consequently, for each $J = 1, \ldots, n$, the vector $(\tau_m^{-1/2}\gamma_{n1}, \ldots, \tau_m^{-J/2}\gamma_{nJ})$ is asymptotically multivariate normal as $n \to \infty$, and therefore $U_{Jn} \xrightarrow{d} U_J$, with U_J following a $N(0, \theta\mu'(\theta)(\tau_m - 1)\sum_{j=1}^{J} \tau_m^{-j})$. Now, from Chebyschev's inequality, (15), and (16), for every $n \geq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, one has $P\left[|U_{Jn} - U_{nn}| > \epsilon\right] \leq \epsilon^{-2}(\tau_m - 1)\theta\mu'(\theta)\sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} \tau_m^{-j}$. In consequence, for some constant k_0,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} P\left[|U_{Jn} - U_{nn}| > \epsilon\right] \leq k_0 \sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} \tau_m^{-j} \to 0, \text{ as } J \to \infty.$$

Therefore, from the fact that $U_J \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \theta\mu'(\theta))$ as $J \to \infty$, and Theorem 25.5 in Billingsley (1979), one obtains

$$U_{nn} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \theta\mu'(\theta)),$$

as $n \to \infty$, and hence (14) is proved.

(ii) (b) This is proved with identical arguments to those of *(ii) (a)*, setting in this case $D_i = Z_i - \tau_m Z_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(Z_0, \ldots, Z_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. Consequently, $E[D_i^2|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = (\sigma^2\mu(\theta) + m^2\theta\mu'(\theta))Z_{i-1}$, $i \geq 1$, and now it is verified that

$$E\left[e^{i\sum_{j=1}^{J} t_j \tau_m^{-j/2}\gamma_{nj}}\right] \to e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\sigma^2\mu(\theta)+m^2\theta\mu'(\theta))\sum_{j=1}^{J} t_j^2\tau_m^{-j}}, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Supplementary material

Simulated data

We consider a CBP whose offspring distribution is given by $p_0 = 0.1084$, $p_1 = 0.2709$, $p_2 = 0.3386$ and $p_3 = 0.2822$, and the control variables $\phi_n(k)$ follow binomial distributions with parameters k and $q = 0.6$. Thus, the offspring mean and variance are $m = 1.7946$ and $\sigma^2 = 0.9443$, respectively; $\theta = 1.5$, $\mu(\theta) = 0.6$ and the mean growth rate is $\tau_m = 1.0767$. We simulated the first 30 generations of this process starting with $Z_0 = 1$ individual. We denote by z_{30}^*, $\overline{z}_{30}$ and z_{30}, the samples based on the entire family tree, on the the total number of individuals and progenitors in each generation, and on the generation sizes only, respectively. The data obtained are the following:

n	Z_n	$\phi_n(Z_n)$	$Z_n(0)$	$Z_n(1)$	$Z_n(2)$	$Z_n(3)$
0	1	1	0	1	0	0
1	1	1	0	1	0	0
2	1	1	0	0	1	0
3	2	1	0	0	1	0
4	2	2	0	0	1	1
5	5	5	0	2	2	1

6	9	6	1	2	2	1
7	9	7	2	2	1	2
8	10	8	0	3	1	4
9	17	14	1	8	3	2
10	20	14	0	8	2	4
11	24	17	2	2	6	7
12	35	25	1	6	8	10
13	52	39	4	11	14	10
14	69	48	10	15	13	10
15	71	38	8	9	14	7
16	58	36	1	5	17	13
17	78	51	5	13	15	18
18	97	61	7	28	13	13
19	93	61	5	22	22	12
20	102	64	6	15	20	23
21	124	72	7	14	25	26
22	142	76	5	24	32	15
23	133	73	9	21	22	21
24	128	81	9	16	33	23
25	151	86	8	21	34	23
26	158	83	7	19	34	23
27	156	94	11	26	32	25
28	165	94	11	29	24	30
29	167	107	10	27	37	33
30	200	·	·	·	·	·
	z_{30}					
	$\overline{z}_{30}$					
			z^*_{30}			

Table 4: Simulated data

Analysis of the robustness of the EM algorithm based on the sample z_{30}

The EM algorithm based on the sample z_{30} is observed not to be at all robust to the choice of the initial values $(p^{(0)}, \theta^{(0)})$, with convergence to different estimates that could be local maxima or saddle points of the log-likelihood function. We detected this fact by starting the algorithm with 300 different initial values, choosing each $p^{(0)}$ randomly from a Dirichlet distribution with all the parameters equal to one (that is, uniformly from the unit simplex) and each $\theta^{(0)}$ through the equation $\theta^{(0)} = q^{(0)}(1 - q^{(0)})^{-1}$, with $q^{(0)}$ sampled from a uniform distribution on the open interval $(0, 1)$. To overcome this problem, we propose in the paper a methodological

approach in order to choose the best approximation to the MLE based on $\mathcal{Z}_n$ -called EM estimate-, that we analyze in detail below.

The log-likelihood function based on the sample $\mathcal{Z}_n = \{Z_0, \ldots, Z_n\}$, denoted by $\ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n)$, is given, in the case of binomial control functions, by

$$\ell(p, \theta \mid Z_l = z_l,\ l = 0, \ldots, n) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \left(\sum_{l=0}^{z_j} P^{*l}_{z_{j+1}} \binom{z_j}{l} \frac{\theta^l}{(1+\theta)^{z_j}} \right) \tag{17}$$

with $P^{*l}_{\cdot}$ denoting the l-fold convolution of the offspring law p. We assume, for computational purposes, that the support of this distribution is $\{0, \ldots, s_{max}\}$, with s_{max} denoting the maximum number of offspring per progenitor (in our example $s_{max} = 3$). Notice that $P^{*l}_{z_{j+1}}$ is the coefficient of the monomial of degree z_{j+1} of the polynomial $(\sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} p_k s^k)^l$. This fact allows us to develop a computational program to evaluate the log–likelihood function on each pair (p, θ).

Thus, the methodological approach we propose consists of taking as EM estimates of the parameters those associated with the greatest log-likelihood when is evaluated at the convergence points of the EM algorithm started with different randomly chosen values of the parameters. Related to our example, in the following figures we show the exact values of the log-likelihood function versus the convergence points of the EM algorithm started with each one of the 300 different seeds, for the parameters p_0 (Figure 10, left), p_1 (Figure 10, center), p_2 (Figure 10, right), p_3 (Figure 11, left) and $\mu(\theta)$ (Figure 11, right).



Figure 10: Exact log-likelihood function versus the convergence points of the EM algorithm for the parameters p_0, p_1 and p_2, denoted by $p_0^{(EM)}$, $p_1^{(EM)}$ and $p_2^{(EM)}$.

The values that maximizes the log-likelihood function (17) are given in Table 5, and shown in Figures 10 and 11 with vertical dashed lines.

Finally, it is also worth mentioning that the expectation of the log-likelihood $\ell(p, \theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n^*,\ \mathcal{Z}_n)$ with respect to the distribution $\mathcal{Z}_n^* | (\mathcal{Z}_n, \{p^{(EM)}, \theta^{(EM)}\})$, with $(p^{(EM)}, \theta^{(EM)})$ a convergence point of the EM algorithm –this kind of expected values can be calculated in each iteration of the algorithm (see Equation (7) in the paper)–,



Figure 11: Exact log-likelihood function versus the convergence points of the EM algorithm for the parameters p_3 and $\mu(\theta)$, denoted by $p_3^{(EM)}$ and $\mu(\theta)^{(EM)}$.

	PARAMETERS							
SAMPLE	p_0	p_1	p_2	p_3	m	σ^2	$\mu(\theta)$	τ_m
z_{30}	.1299	.3083	.3283	.2335	1.6653	.9496	.6579	1.0957
TRUE VALUE	.1084	.2709	.3386	.2822	1.7946	.9443	.6000	1.0767

Table 5: Estimates of the parameters of interest based on the sample z_{30}.

can not be used to determine the maximum likelihood estimates, as an alternative to our proposal. This is due to the fact that it can happen that

$$E_{\mathcal{Z}_n^*|(\mathcal{Z}_n,\{p^{(EM)},\theta^{(EM)}\})}[\ell(p,\theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n^*,\mathcal{Z}_n)] \geq E_{\mathcal{Z}_n^*|(\mathcal{Z}_n,\{\tilde{p}^{(EM)},\tilde{\theta}^{(EM)}\})}[\ell(p,\theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_n^*,\mathcal{Z}_n)]$$

and

$$\ell(p^{(EM)},\theta^{(EM)} \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) < \ell(\tilde{p}^{(EM)},\tilde{\theta}^{(EM)} \mid \mathcal{Z}_n),$$

being $(p^{(EM)},\ \theta^{(EM)})$ and $(\tilde{p}^{(EM)},\ \tilde{\theta}^{(EM)})$ two convergence points provided by the EM algorithm. Figure 12 shows this fact. We plot on it $\ell(p^{(EM)},\theta^{(EM)}\ |z_{30})$ versus $E_{\mathcal{Z}_{30}^*|(z_{30},\{p^{(EM)},\theta^{(EM)}\})}[\ell(p,\theta \mid \mathcal{Z}_{30}^*,z_{30})]$, with $(p^{(EM)},\theta^{(EM)})$ the convergence points of the EM algorithm started with the 300 randomly chosen seeds.

Computational complexity

Focussing our interest in the case of binomial control functions, in order to determine upper bounds of the values b_l and b_l^*, let us introduce the following functions. Let $b(z_l,\phi_l^*,z_{l+1},s_{max})$ the function that provides the number of possible vectors $(z_l(0),\ldots,z_l(s_{max}))$ such that $\sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} z_l(k)=\phi_l^*$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} kz_l(k)=z_{l+1}$, with z_l, ϕ_l^* and z_{l+1} whatever possible values of the variables Z_l, $\phi_l(Z_l)$ and Z_{l+1}, respectively, and s_{max} with the maximum number of offspring per progenitor. Notice that given the sample $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_n$, then $b_l=b(Z_l,\phi_l(Z_l),Z_{l+1},s_{max})$, $l=0,1,\ldots,n-1$. It is also remarkable that b_l depends on Z_l through $\phi_l(Z_l)$. Analogously, let $b^*(z_l,z_{l+1},s_{max})$ the



Figure 12: Exact log-likelihood function versus expected log-likelihood.

function that provides the number of possible vectors $(z_l(0), \ldots, z_l(s_{max}))$ such that $1 \leq \sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} z_l(k) \leq z_l$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} k z_l(k) = z_{l+1}$, with z_l, and z_{l+1} whatever possible values of the variables Z_l and Z_{l+1}, respectively (we have not considered the case $\sum_{k=0}^{s_{max}} z_l(k) = 0$ because it does not lead to any factible value in the case $z_{l+1} = 0$ or to the null vector if $z_{l+1} = 0$; in any case its contribution is irrelevant for our purpose). Notice that $b^*(z_l, z_{l+1}, s_{max}) = \sum_{1 \leq \phi_l^* \leq z_l} b(z_l, \phi_l^*, z_{l+1}, s_{max})$. Assuming the sample $\mathcal{Z}_n$, $b_l^* = b^*(Z_l, Z_{l+1}, s_{max})$, $l = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$.

Thus, to obtain upper bounds of the functions b and b^* in terms of z_l and s_{max}, we determined the functions

$$\begin{aligned} b_{max} &= b_{max}(z_l, s_{max}) = \max_{\substack{1 \leq \phi_l^* \leq z_l \\ 0 \leq z_{l+1} \leq s_{max} \cdot \phi_l^*}} b(z_l, \phi_l^*, z_{l+1}, s_{max}) \\ &= \max_{0 \leq z_{l+1} \leq s_{max} \cdot z_l} b(z_l, z_l, z_{l+1}, s_{max}) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

and

$$b_{max}^* = b_{max}^*(z_l, s_{max}) = \max_{0 \leq z_{l+1} \leq s_{max} \cdot z_l} b^*(z_l, z_{l+1}, s_{max}). \tag{19}$$

To get these maximum values, we have considered three possible values of $s_{max} = 3, 4, 5$, and for each one we have obtained the values of the function b for ϕ_l^* going from 1 to 167 (this is the maximum value of $\phi_l(Z_l)$ in our simulated sample -see Table 4) and for z_{l+1} going from 0 to $167 \cdot s_{max}$. The values obtained have been stored in matrices of dimension $(167 \cdot s_{max} + 1) \times 167$. Each column corresponds to a possible value of ϕ_l^*, going from 1 to 167, and each row to one of z_{l+1}, from 0 to $167 \cdot s_{max}$. Notice that the non-null values for the column corresponding to ϕ_l^* are the $\phi_l^* \cdot s_{max} + 1$ first elements. The matrices obtained are stored in the files `tree-max-3.cvs` (for $s_{max} = 3$), `tree-max-4.cvs` (for $s_{max} = 4$) and `tree-max-5.cvs` (for $s_{max} = 5$). From them, and taking into account (18) and (19), it is easy to obtain the values of $b_{max}(z_l, s_{max})$ and $b_{max}^*(z_l, s_{max})$, which are

given in Table 6. For each value of s_{max}, analysing the relationship between z_l and $b_{max}(z_l, s_{max})$ and z_l and $b^*_{max}(z_l, s_{max})$, using polynomial regression methods, it can be concluded that $b_{max}(z_l, s_{max}) = O(z_l^{s_{max}-1})$ and $b^*_{max}(z_l, s_{max}) = O(z_l^{s_{max}})$. Consequently, we infer that $b_l = O(Z_l^{s_{max}-1})$ and $b^*_l = O(Z_l^{s_{max}})$.

	$s_{max}=3$		$s_{max}=4$		$s_{max}=5$	
z_l	b_{max}	b^*_{max}	b_{max}	b^*_{max}	b_{max}	b^*_{max}
1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	3	3	4	3	4
3	3	6	5	8	6	9
4	5	9	8	14	12	19
5	6	15	12	24	20	36
6	8	22	18	37	32	63
7	10	29	24	58	49	103
8	13	39	33	85	73	164
9	15	51	43	117	102	249
10	18	66	55	164	141	369
11	21	84	69	218	190	525
12	25	103	86	287	252	736
13	28	124	104	372	325	1006
14	32	150	126	473	414	1355
15	36	178	150	598	521	1790
16	41	213	177	736	649	2332
17	45	249	207	906	795	3000
18	50	286	241	1102	967	3809
19	55	331	277	1326	1165	4789
20	61	378	318	1585	1394	5953
21	66	433	362	1875	1651	7337
22	72	492	410	2210	1944	8965
23	78	552	462	2586	2275	10873
24	85	618	519	3002	2649	13091
25	91	691	579	3478	3061	15653
26	98	769	645	3997	3523	18603
27	105	856	715	4575	4035	21982
28	113	945	790	5217	4604	25833
29	120	1036	870	5923	5225	30213
30	128	1140	956	6706	5910	35153
31	136	1246	1046	7545	6660	40728
32	145	1366	1143	8475	7483	46986
33	153	1489	1245	9486	8372	54003
34	162	1614	1353	10585	9343	61824
35	171	1750	1467	11779	10395	70533
36	181	1893	1588	13062	11538	80195
37	190	2046	1714	14456	12764	90880
38	200	2209	1848	15956	14090	102681
39	210	2374	1988	17565	15516	115675
40	221	2545	2135	19309	17053	129965
41	231	2731	2289	21161	18691	145621
42	242	2921	2451	23146	20451	162758
43	253	3129	2619	25271	22330	181469
44	265	3340	2796	27544	24342	201853
45	276	3553	2980	29976	26476	224027
46	288	3784	3172	32537	28754	248116
47	300	4021	3372	35277	31174	274220
48	313	4274	3581	38181	33751	302490
49	325	4536	3797	41269	36471	333023
50	338	4801	4023	44542	39361	365983
51	351	5077	4257	47991	42416	401493
52	365	5368	4500	51647	45654	439716
53	378	5668	4752	55500	49060	480793
54	392	5987	5014	59569	52662	524907
55	406	6309	5284	63877	56455	572201
56	421	6634	5565	68388	60459	622833
57	435	6985	5855	73135	64656	676982
58	450	7339	6155	78124	69079	734837
59	465	7717	6465	83383	73720	796574
60	481	8102	6786	88913	78602	862397
61	496	8490	7116	94674	83705	932496
62	512	8896	7458	100732	89064	1007118
63	528	9316	7810	107061	94671	1086429
64	545	9751	8173	113710	100551	1170652
65	561	10204	8547	120663	106681	1260022
66	578	10661	8933	127909	113101	1354759
67	595	11126	9329	135487	119799	1455114
68	613	11617	9738	143377	126804	1561303
69	630	12113	10158	151630	134091	1673615
70	648	12640	10590	160256	141702	1792281
71	666	13171	11034	169209	149625	1917588
72	685	13706	11491	178531	157891	2049806
73	703	14267	11959	188219	166471	2189195
74	722	14839	12441	198341	175413	2336068
75	741	15434	12935	208875	184701	2490790
76	761	16045	13442	219772	194370	2653595
77	780	16660	13962	231113	204389	2824802
78	800	17290	14496	242854	214808	3004715
79	820	17945	15042	255093	225610	3193697
80	841	18611	15603	267785	236833	3392022
81	861	19307	16177	280916	248442	3600097
82	882	20008	16765	294534	260493	3818240
83	903	20713	17367	308599	272965	4046845
84	925	21454	17984	323218	285900	4286352
85	946	22202	18614	338373	299260	4537044
86	968	22982	19260	354009	313104	4799346

87	990	23774	19920	370176	327410	5073587
88	1013	24571	20595	386859	342223	5360240
89	1035	25391	21285	404172	357501	5659681
90	1058	26233	21991	422074	373309	5972353
91	1081	27094	22711	440500	389620	6298680
92	1105	27983	23448	459547	406484	6639100
93	1128	28877	24200	479155	423856	6994059
94	1152	29780	24968	499457	441804	7364046
95	1176	30722	25752	520404	460300	7749502
96	1201	31669	26553	541966	479397	8150987
97	1225	32659	27369	564199	499045	8569019
98	1250	33656	28203	587040	519319	9004036
99	1275	34658	29053	610656	540186	9456496
100	1301	35693	29920	635009	561704	9926962
101	1326	36746	30804	660026	583820	10415946
102	1352	37827	31706	685766	606612	10924007
103	1378	38932	32624	712211	630045	11451680
104	1405	40043	33561	739484	654181	11999519
105	1431	41171	34515	767575	678962	12568160
106	1458	42335	35487	796381	704473	13158290
107	1485	43511	36477	826014	730674	13770375
108	1513	44730	37486	856405	757632	14405000
109	1540	45955	38512	887694	785285	15062801
110	1568	47186	39558	919870	813722	15744388
111	1596	48461	40622	952866	842901	16450391
112	1625	49748	41705	986747	872893	17181481
113	1653	51074	42807	1021440	903631	17938314
114	1682	52419	43929	1057121	935211	18721555
115	1711	53770	45069	1093798	967585	19531923
116	1741	55148	46230	1131352	1000830	20370041
117	1770	56558	47410	1169850	1034875	21236691
118	1800	57989	48610	1209272	1069820	22132755
119	1830	59459	49830	1249738	1105615	23058898
120	1861	60936	51071	1291297	1142341	24015730
121	1891	62421	52331	1333791	1179921	25004058
122	1922	63959	53613	1377348	1218463	26024628
123	1953	65504	54915	1421889	1257911	27078204
124	1985	67100	56238	1467550	1298352	28165598
125	2016	68708	57582	1514386	1339705	29287641
126	2048	70323	58948	1562277	1382082	30445101
127	2080	71976	60334	1611296	1425424	31638919
128	2113	73655	61743	1661361	1469823	32870171
129	2145	75366	63173	1712643	1515192	34139421
130	2178	77111	64625	1765228	1561651	35447522
131	2211	78863	66099	1818932	1609135	36795378
132	2245	80633	67596	1873831	1657742	38183913
133	2278	82452	69114	1929902	1707380	39613984
134	2312	84282	70656	1987249	1758174	41086588
135	2346	86169	72220	2046012	1810056	42602574
136	2381	88064	73807	2105960	1863129	44162971
137	2415	89966	75417	2167236	1917295	45768701
138	2450	91919	77051	2229752	1972687	47420788
139	2485	93891	78707	2293624	2029230	49120185
140	2521	95907	80388	2359009	2087034	50868375
141	2556	97950	82092	2425713	2145996	52665971
142	2592	100001	83820	2493818	2206254	54513965
143	2628	102081	85572	2563232	2267730	56413420
144	2665	104204	87349	2634106	2330539	58365425
145	2701	106349	89149	2706640	2394571	60371037
146	2738	108546	90975	2780565	2459973	62431379
147	2775	110751	92825	2855965	2526660	64547499
148	2813	112964	94700	2932815	2594754	66720601
149	2850	115242	96600	3011200	2664140	68951927
150	2888	117530	98526	3091346	2734970	71242921
151	2926	119876	100476	3172971	2807155	73594370
152	2965	122241	102453	3256219	2880823	76007435
153	3003	124614	104455	3340992	2955852	78483347
154	3042	127029	106483	3427378	3032403	81023258
155	3081	129480	108537	3515649	3110380	83628483
156	3121	131965	110618	3605542	3189918	86300210
157	3160	134495	112724	3697138	3270889	89039747
158	3200	137034	114858	3790336	3353460	91848366
159	3240	139590	117018	3885301	3437531	94727319
160	3281	142209	119205	3982229	3523243	97677964
161	3321	144837	121419	4080903	3610461	100701803
162	3362	147538	123661	4181362	3699361	103800552
163	3403	150248	125929	4283578	3789835	106975060
164	3445	152967	128226	4387645	3882032	110226672
165	3486	155742	130550	4493778	3975811	113556854
166	3528	158544	132902	4601761	4071354	116966891
167	3570	161394	135282	4711691	4168549	120458340

Table 6: Values of $b_{max}(z_l, s_{max})$ and $b^*_{max}(z_l, s_{max})$

References

Bercu, B., 1999. Weighted estimation and tracking for Bienaymè–Galton–Watson processes with adaptive control. Statistics & Probability Letters 42, 415–421.

Bernhardt, P.H., Zhang, D., Wang, H.J. 2015. A fast EM algorithm for fitting joint models of a binary response and multiple longitudinal covariates subject to detection limits. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis, 85, 37-53.

Billingsley, P., 1979. Probability and Measure. Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Bowman, A., Azzalini, A., 2014. R package `sm`: nonparametric smoothing methods (version 2.2-5.4). University of Glasgow, UK and Università di Padova, Italia.

Bruss, F., Slavtchova-Bojkova, M., 1999. On waiting times to populate an environment and a question of statistical inference. Journal of Applied Probability 36, 261–267.

Daskalova, N., 2014. Nonlinear Dynamics of Electronic Systems. Vol. 438 of Communications in Computer and Information Science. Springer, Ch. EM Algorithm for Estimation of the Offspring Probabilities in Some Branching Models, pp. 181–188.

del Puerto, I., Yanev, N., 2008. Leading-Edge Applied Mathematical Modeling Research. Nova Science Publishers, Inc, Ch. 11: Branching Processes with Multitype Random Control Functions: subcritical case, pp. 363–374.

Dion, J. P., Essebbar, B., 1995. On the statistics of controlled branching processes. Lecture Notes in Statistics 99, 14–21.

González, M., del Puerto, I., 2012. Diffusion approximation of an array of controlled branching processes. Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability 14, 843–861.

González, M., Gutiérrez, C., Martínez, R., 2012. Expectation-Maximization algorithm for determining natural selection of Y-linked genes through two-sex branching processes. Journal of Computational Biology 19, 1015–1026.

González, M., Martínez, R., del Puerto, I., 2004. Nonparametric estimation of the offspring distribution and mean for a controlled branching process. Test 13, 465–479.

González, M., Martínez, R., del Puerto, I., 2005a. Estimation of the variance for a controlled branching process. Test 14, 199–213.

González, M., Molina, M., del Puerto, I., 2002. On the class of controlled branching process with random control functions. Journal of Applied Probability 39, 804–815.

González, M., Molina, M., del Puerto, I., 2005b. Asymptotic behaviour of the critical controlled branching processes with random control functions. Journal of Applied Probability 42, 463–477.

González, M., Molina, M., del Puerto, I., 2006. Geometric growth for stochastic difference equations with application to branching populations. Bernoulli 12 (5), 931–942.

Guttorp, P., 1991. Statistical inference for branching processes. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Haccou, P., Jagers, P., Vatutin, V., 2005. Branching processes: variation, growth and extinction of populations. Cambridge University Press.

Hall, C., Heyde, C. C., 1980. Martingale limit theory and its applications. Academic Press, Inc.

Hautphenne, S., Fackrell, M., 2014. An EM algorithm for the model fitting of Markovian binary trees. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 70, 19–34.

Heyde, C. C., Brown, B. M., 1971. An invariance principle and some convergence rate results for branching processes. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitsth. Verw. Geb. 20, 271–278.

Jagers, P., 1975. Branching processes with biological applications. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Kimmel, M., Axelrod, D. E., 2002. Branching processes in biology. Springer-Verlag.

McLachlan, G., Krishnan, T., 2008. The EM algorithm and extensions. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

R Core Team, 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
URL `http://www.R-project.org/`

Rahimov, I., Al-Sabah, W., 2007. Controlled branching processes with continuous states. Journal of Applied Probability and Statistics 2, 123–137.

Sriram, T., 1994. Invalidity of bootstrap for critical branching processes with immigration. The Annals of Statistics 22, 565–1114.

Sriram, T. N., Bhattacharya, A., González, M., Martínez, R., del Puerto, I., 2007. Estimation of the offspring mean in a controlled branching process with a random control function. Stochastic Processes and their Applications 117, 928–946.

Veen, A., Schoenberg, F., 2008. Estimation of space-time branching process models in seismology using an EM–type algorithm. Journal of the American Statistical Association 103, 614–624.

Venables, B., Hornik, K., Maechler, M., 2014. polynom: A Collection of Functions to Implement a Class for Univariate Polynomial Manipulations. R package version 1.3-8. S original by Bill Venables, packages for R by Kurt Hornik and Martin Maechler.

Wang, N., Wang, L., McMahan, C.S. 2015. Regression analysis of bivariate current status data under the Gamma-frailty proportional hazards model using the EM algorithm. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis, 83, 140-150.

Yanev, G. P., Yanev, N. M., 1996. Branching processes with two types of emigration and state-dependent immigration. Lecture Notes in Statistics 114, 216–228.

Yanev, N. M., 1976. Conditions for degeneracy of ϕ-branching processes with random ϕ. Theory of Probability and its Applications 20, 421–428.